way to give the children a chance. Mechanization of agriculture is increasing at a rapid rate, and "Today's migrant child will be tomorrow's displaced person because of mechanization unless something is done now."

Here on the west coast, there are many new programs planned or starting.

I can tell you that the Office of Economic Opportunity will soon make grants of over $1 million to local agencies in California and other States for new services to migrant workers. In addition to education, there will be programs for job retraining and better health.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is also having considerable success in its efforts to reverse the school dropout trend through the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs. The Stockton school district is sponsoring one such program.

One of the biggest programs of this kind in the country is in Los Angeles, where the Youth Opportunity Board was given a grant of $2.7 million to encourage the retraining and further education of disadvantaged teenage boys.

So you can see that we are making progress. Politically, Spanish-speaking Americans are finally awakening to the power of the ballot in asserting their rights.

My own State of New Mexico was for many years the only one where Spanish-speaking Americans had real political influence. But great strides have been made in both California and Texas in recent years.

Here in San Francisco, your citizen's foundation—and other groups, I am sure—are attacking the problems of the Spanish-speaking American on many fronts.

Night schools to teach English to adults have been established, and a free job service has been founded. The foundation is working with dropouts and in education of youth.

I commend their programs to your attention and your support. They are moving ahead in the finest tradition of American social action. With your support, they will show the way to a better life for many of your fellow citizens.

I thank you.

Do Not Free the Monsters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I would urge Members of this honorable body who have not already done so to sign the petition suggesting to the Federal Republic of Germany that a legal device not be permitted to give freedom to unpunished Nazi war criminals.

This rather unusual action, designed to encourage members of the German Parliament to carry through a bill to achieve this end, is warranted, I believe, by most unusual circumstances.

Reports are current that mass murderers wait patiently for the day when the statute of limitations will allow them to crawl out of their hiding places to taunt decency with their public presence.

Ordinarily, I believe in the end sought by the statute of limitations. But there is nothing ordinary about mass murder, about human torture, about degradation of human beings, about fiendish experiments conducted for sadistic pleasure.

All with a shred of decency must cry out for punishment for the fiends and monsters responsible.

As noted, unusual circumstances excuse unusual actions, and I wish to commend to others the action I have taken in signing the petition now being circulated among us.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1965

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

The Most Reverend Archbishop Vasili of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in America offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost: Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we, Thy children, humbly bow our heads before Thee, and offer our profound gratitude for the abundant blessings Thou hast bestowed upon America and her people.

O Lord and Redeemer, we ask Your assistance, that a constant spirit of wisdom, strength, and love may direct our esteemed President of the United States, and that Your blessings of counsel and guidance may remain abundantly with this august body, the honorable Senate of the United States, this temple of peace, freedom, and justice. Merciful Father, we recommend to Thy grace the souls of the heroic dead of our Armed Forces, and the countless defenders of freedom throughout the world. Grant them eternal rest in Thy kingdom in heaven.

Eternal God and Saviour, we pray today for Thy divine mercy and judgment for the welfare of the Byelorussian nation, whose proclamation of independence, as the Byelorussian National Republic, was observed 47 years ago, and whose people have striven during these years to free themselves from the tyranny of an atheistic oppression, in the hope of enjoying the liberties and freedom, under God, as is the way in the United States. We pray today that the benefits of freedom granted to democracies all over the world may serve as an infallible encouragement to the people of Byelorussia, for the vision of everlasting freedom is not lost among them, but burns as a torch deep in their hearts with the desire to be a member in the worldwide family of the free and God-fearing nations.

We humbly bow our heads before Thee, our God and Redeemer, and faithfully implore Thee: Accept this, our prayer, and bless the United States of America and Byelorussia.

May Thy glorious name, our God and Saviour, reign and shine in our hearts and be blessed now and forever. Amen.

JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 11, 1965, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 11, 1965,

The following report of a committee was submitted on March 12, 1965:

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 974. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes; with supplemental, individual, and additional views (Rept. No. 123); which was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 12, 1965, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 301) to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, 89th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MADDEN of Indiana, Mr. BROOKS of Texas, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFIN of Michigan, and Mr. HALL of Missouri as members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall in the Senate during the 80th and 81st Congresses.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following

concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 103 of the 86th Congress;

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, of Texas;

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?";

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of inaugural addresses from President Washington to President Johnson, and providing for additional copies;

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill;

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document No. 103 of the 88th Congress;

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a study of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs; and

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the publication as a House document of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839).

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions of the House were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 103 of the 86th Congress.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed an additional thirteen thousand five hundred and fifty copies of House Document Numbered 103 of the Eighty-sixth Congress in the style and format directed by the Joint Committee on Printing; two thousand five hundred and seventy-five of such copies shall be for the use of the Senate and ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five of such copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, of Texas.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Sam Rayburn, presented by the Texas State Society in the Rayburn Building, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a House document. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such House document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate and nine thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, to be prorated for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) with the permission of the copyright owner of the book "Our American Government—1001 Questions on How It Works," with answers by Wright Patman, published by Scholastic Magazines, Incorporated, there shall be printed as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; and that there shall be printed one million eighty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which two hundred and six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and eight hundred and seventy-eight thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of inaugural addresses from President Washington to President Johnson, and providing for additional copies.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a collection of inaugural addresses, from President George Washington to President Lyndon B. Johnson, compiled from research volumes and State papers by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that sixteen thousand one hundred and twenty-five additional copies be printed, of which ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and five thousand one hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate.

SEC. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a House document all remarks by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in the Halls of Congress which constitute tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed five thousand eight hundred and sixty additional copies of such House document, of which one thousand and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and four thousand three hundred and sixty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document No. 103 of the 88th Congress.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document 103 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable Edwin E. Willis; and that there be printed one hundred thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of sixty days after which the unused balance shall revert to the House Document Room.

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a study of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, one thousand additional copies of a study made by that committee of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs.

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the publication as a House document of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839).

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) there be printed as a House document the Department of State white paper, issued February 17, 1965, relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839). The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed sixty-three thousand six hundred additional copies of such House document of which twenty thousand shall be for the use of the Senate, and forty-three thousand six hundred for the use of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

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

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE 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.

RESUMÉ OF SENATE LEGISLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during this past week the Senate cleared for the White House another Presidential recommendation providing for a $750 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank—over a 3-year period at the rate of $250 million a year. The leadership

is very grateful to the distinguished chairman of Foreign Relations, Senator FULBRIGHT, for his expertise in handling both the bill and the conference report which was so ably opposed by Senators GRUENING and MORSE.

Thanks again go to Senator FULBRIGHT for his handling of H.R. 2998 which was returned to the House amended. This measure, another Presidential recommendation, authorized an appropriation of $20 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the Disarmament Agency. Recognition for an extremely interesting and informative debate is due Senators CLARK, MORSE, PROXMIRE, JAVITS, AIKEN, TYDINGS, ELLENDER, DODD, PASTORE, HARTKE, HICKENLOOPER, and BASS.

The Senate also sent to the House the Monroney resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 2—establishing a 12-member bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements. The resolution was guided through the Senate under the capable management of Senator MONRONEY, the original sponsor and negotiator of the 1946 Reorganization Act. Much credit must also be given Senators CLARK, MORSE, JAVITS, and CASE for their participation in the debate. Action has also been completed by the House on this resolution and the Monroney committee membership has been selected.

Under the capable management of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, LISTER HILL, the Senate cleared for the House S. 510, a bill extending four existing grant-in-aid programs authorized by the Public Health Service to provide assistance to the States and their communities in financing essential public health services. This, too, was a Presidential recommendation and makes the 13th one the Senate has passed this year.

Thanks to Senator SYMINGTON, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Stockpiling, the Senate amended and returned to the House H.R. 1496, a bill providing for the disposal of 150,000 tons of lead and zinc each, and the sale of 100,000 short tons of copper to domestic producers.

This week the Senate will consider another Presidential recommendation, S. 974, amendments to the Manpower Training Act.

Committee activity scheduled for the week of March 15–20 as indicated below shows quite clearly the committees are moving as rapidly as is feasible:

Senate Agriculture has scheduled an executive session on S. 821, a Presidential recommendation relating to tobacco acreage, poundage, and marketing quotas.

Senate Appropriations has concluded its hearings on the Interior Department and related agencies. Agriculture, Defense, Labor-HEW are still in progress with Treasury-Post Office scheduled to begin on March 16.

Senate Banking will continue its balance-of-payments hearings through March 18.

Senate Commerce is continuing hearings March 16 on a bill establishing a National Oceanographic Council and on the same day will hold hearings on walnut logging exports. S. 558 will be the subject of hearings on March 17-19, a bill relating to foreign markets for U.S. products. Hearings have been concluded on the annual authorization for the Coast Guard, rail transportation service in the northeastern seaboard area, and the status of helicopter service.

Senate District Committee has concluded hearings on its home rule bill.

Senate Foreign Relations is continuing its hearings on economic foreign aid.

Senate Interior will hold hearings March 17–19 on the Assateague Island National Seashore.

Senate Judiciary is continuing its hearings on immigration legislation and the Antitrust Subcommittee will consider concentration on March 16 through the 18th.

Senate Labor is starting hearings March 16 on S. 600, the higher education bill.

Senate Public Works is having a subcommittee markup March 17 on S. 560, water pollution control at Federal installations.

Senate Space Committee will continue its hearings March 15 on its annual authorization bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a résumé of Senate legislative activity through March 11, 1965, prepared by the Senate Democratic policy committee.

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

SENATE LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY THROUGH MARCH 11, 1965, SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

The tally sheet so far ((PR)—Presidential recommendation):

Senate activity:

Days in session	35
Hours in session	148:13
Total measures passed	116
Confirmations	25,023
Public Laws	4

APPROPRIATIONS

Agricultural supplemental: Appropriated $1.6 billion for Commodity Credit Corporation, allowed the President final discretion in shipping surplus food to Egypt, and suspended until May 1 the planned closing of 11 VA hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and the merger of 17 regional offices. Public Law 89–2. (PR.)

CONGRESS

Joint Committee on the Budget: Established a 14-member Joint Committee on the Budget composed of 7 members from each Appropriations Committee, 4 to 3 ratio. The purpose of the Joint Committee is to serve the Appropriations Committees year round with the same expertise as the Bureau of Budget for the Executive. S. 2 passed Senate January 27.

Joint Committee on Organization of Congress: Established a 12-member bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements. Rules changes are eliminated from the study. Authorizes $150,000 through January 31, 1966, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. First report to be submitted 120 days following effective date of the resolution. Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 passed Senate, March 9, 1965; passed House, March 11, 1965.

DEFENSE

Zinc, lead, and copper: Authorized the disposal of 150,000 tons each of zinc and lead and the sale of 100,000 short tons of copper to producers and processors. H.R. 1496 passed Senate, amended, March 11.

Stockpile Act: Provides more statutory guidance on the purpose for which materials would be stockpiled; provides for disclosure to Congress and the public, pertinent information on the management; permits disposals of surplus material without requiring congressional action on each while retaining in Congress the power to disapprove proposed disposals; and makes contracts for furnishing materials to the stockpile subject to the Renegotiation Act. S. 28 passed Senate, February 9. (PR.)

ECONOMY

Aid to Appalachia: Authorized $1,092.4 million in aid to the 11-State Appalachian region. $840 million of this amount will be in the form of Federal grants for a 5-year highway construction program and a 2-year authorization of $252.4 million for a variety of economic development projects. Public Law 89–4. (PR.)

Disaster victims: Directs the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make an immediate study of alternative programs which could be established to help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in flood, earthquake, and other natural disasters, including alternative methods of Federal insurance as well as the existing flood insurance program. S. 408 passed Senate January 28.

Gold cover: Repeals the requirement of 25 percent gold backing of commercial bank deposits held by the Federal Reserve banks, but retains the 25-percent requirement against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. Public Law 89–3. (PR.)

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Goddard Day: Designate March 16, 1965, as Goddard Day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern-day rocketry. S. 301. Public Law 89–5.

HEALTH

Community health services extension: Extended four existing grant-in-aid programs authorized by the Public Health Service to provide assistance to the States and their communities in financing essential public health services. S. 510 passed Senate March 11. (PR.)

Loan cancellation: Permits cancellations of a portion of the unpaid balance of a student loan awarded to a physician or dentist who practices in a shortage area. S. 576 passed Senate January 28.

Water pollution control: Vests authority to establish purity standards for interstate water and authorizes $80 million in new grants to help States and localities develop new methods of separating combined stormwater and sewage-carrying sewer systems; increase the dollar ceiling limitations on individual grants for construction of waste treatment works from $600,000 to $1 million for a single project and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a joint project involving two or more communities. S. 4 passed Senate January 28. (PR.)

HOUSING

Distressed homeowners: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to extend aid to distressed homeowners who, after relying on VA or FHA construction standards and inspections, find structural or other major defects in their properties purchased with GI mortgage loans which affect the livability of the property. S. 507 passed Senate January 27. (PR.)

INTERNATIONAL

Coffee implementation: This bill implements the International Coffee Agreement ratified in 1963, and authorizes the President to require all coffee entering U.S. markets and all exports of coffee to accompanied by a certificate of origin or a certificate of reexport. Limits imports of coffee from countries which have not joined in the agreement; and requires certain recordkeeping. S. 701 passed Senate February 2. (PR.)

Disarmament Act amendments: Authorizes an appropriation of $20 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the Disarmament Agency, thus continuing the authorization on the same basis as fiscal years 1964 and 1965. H.R. 2998 passed Senate amended March 9. (PR.)

Inter-American Development Bank: Provides for a $750 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank—over a 3-year period at the rate of $250 million a year. This represents the U.S. share of a planned $900 million increase in the fund which will serve to strengthen multinational aid and the Alliance for Progress. (PR.) Public Law 89–6.

PRESIDENCY

Presidential succession: Proposed an amendment to the Constitution that will totally replace article II, section I, clause 5, relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency. Senate Joint Resolution 1 passed Senate February 19. (PR.)

RESOURCE AND RECREATION BUILDUP

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area: Authorizes $355,000 for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Montana and Wyoming to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the proposed Yellowtail Reservoir, and for the preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the area. S. 491 passed Senate February 10. (PR.)

Kaniksu National Forest: Authorizes up to $500,000 from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest to include lands necessary for the protection and conservation of the scenic values and natural environment of Upper Priest Lake in Idaho. S. 435 passed Senate March 4.

Manson irrigation unit, Washington: Authorizes $12.3 million for the construction and operation of the Manson unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project. The Manson unit has an irrigation potential of 5,770 acres of land, with half of the costs reimbursable. S. 490 passed Senate February 10.

Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho: Authorizes $630,000 for the purchase of 1,500 acres of land to establish the Nez Perce National Historical Park to commemorate, preserve, and interpret the historic values in the early Nez Perce Indian culture, the tribe's war of 1877 with U.S. cavalry troops, the Lewis and Clark expedition through the area early in the 19th century, subsequent fur trading, gold mining, logging, and missionary activity. S. 60 passed Senate February 10.

River basin planning: Authorizes Federal grants of $5 million a year in matching funds to States for State project planning over a 10-year period; sets up a Cabinet-level water resources council to coordinate river basin planning; and authorizes creation of river basin commissions for regional planning. S. 21 passed Senate February 25. H.R. 1111, House Calendar. (PR.)

Yakima project, Washington: Authorizes $5.1 million for the extension, construction, and operation of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project with an irrigation potential of 7,000 additional acres (present irrigated acreage is 19,000). All but approximately $135,000 is reimbursable. S. 794 passed Senate February 10.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Star, issue of March 13, there appeared an article by Gould Lincoln entitled "Amazing, Incomparable DIRKSEN." I ask unanimous consent that the article, which does full credit to the distinguished minority leader—credit well deserved—be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I had prepared for insertion in the RECORD a statement commending Gould Lincoln, political news analyst of the Washington Evening Star, for his article laudatory of our distinguished minority leader, the amazing and incomparable EVERETT DIRKSEN. The distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], in his usual gracious manner has already placed the article in the RECORD, so I shall, instead, join him in that action.

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

AMAZING, INCOMPARABLE DIRKSEN

(By Gould Lincoln)

When a showdown comes, the architect of Republican policy on Capitol Hill is Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, minority leader. He is more than that. Despite the fact his Senate constituency is one less than a third of that body, DIRKSEN is a dominant figure. He is and has been necessary to the Democrats as well as to the Republicans. Like President Johnson when he was Democratic leader of the Senate, DIRKSEN has a great awareness of the possible. And like Johnson, he is a master tactician, with an ability to get things done.

The Republican record, on which the party must run in the 1966 congressional and gubernatorial election will be made at the Capitol. DIRKSEN is in position to speak for the Republican party. He is more likely to exercise leadership through action rather than words—though he can be hard hitting whenever he wishes to speak.

The Illinois Senator does not maintain his leadership through dictatorial and arm-twisting practices. Rather his strength lies in bringing together other Republicans in the Senate, conservative, moderate, and liberal, through persuasion and reason.

DIRKSEN took over the Republican leader's job in the Senate in 1958. He was for 2 years a strong right arm for President Eisenhower in the Senate. Two Democratic Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, have looked to him for support in foreign relations and in civil rights legislation, and had it.

It was DIRKSEN's stand in the fight for ratification of the atomic test ban treaty and later in the drive to pass the 1964 Civil Rights Act that helped put those measures across. DIRKSEN delivered the votes which made it possible to break the Democratic filibuster against the civil rights bill. He is expected to play an important role in the passage of the new voting rights bill demanded by the President and which is expected to be sponsored by DIRKSEN and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, majority leader. DIRKSEN did much to simplify and shorten the bill before it was introduced.

He hopes to get it through the Senate without a filibuster, believing that popular demand for the legislation, aroused by the denial of voting rights to Negroes, accompanied by violence against civil rights workers seeking to register Negroes as voters in those States will be effective, and because another filibuster by the conservatives will strengthen the hands of the progressives on both sides of the Senate aisle in their effort to force a majority rule for ending debate in the Senate.

Cloture now can only be invoked by a two-thirds vote of all Senators present and voting. DIRKSEN himself believes the cloture should remain as it is—the only protection against a majority running roughshod over a minority.

It was DIRKSEN who recently rallied all the Republican Party leaders, Senate and House, to issue a strong statement upholding President Johnson's Vietnam policy, including the air strikes at Communist North Vietnam. He does not believe that the U.S. Commander in Chief should have a divided Nation back of him in matters affecting the safety of the United States, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican.

DIRKSEN was 37 years old when he first came to Congress in 1933. He served eight terms in the House, where he made a reputation for independence and as an orator who quoted the scriptures, used sarcasm, humor, and the lash on occasion. In January 1949 he voluntarily retired from the House because he feared he was going blind. Recovered, he ran for the Senate in 1950, defeating Scott Lucas, Democratic leader of the Senate.

In the House, DIRKSEN supported President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's foreign policy in 1941, saying, "To oppose that policy now could only weaken the President's position, impair our prestige, and imperil the Nation," but opposed Roosevelt's New Deal.

He once described himself as "just an old-fashioned or garden variety of Republican who believes in the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and Abraham Lincoln." It is still his creed.

SENATOR CHURCH AND THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the March 13 issue of the Washington Star there appeared an article by Max Freedman entitled "Senator CHURCH Defends President." I ask unanimous consent that that article, which I believe is a true analysis of the situation described, and which does credit to one of the steadiest Senators in this Chamber, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR CHURCH DEFENDS PRESIDENT

(By Max Freedman)

Among the Senators who have expressed doubts about U.S. policy in Vietnam and in southeast Asia, a position of leadership belongs to Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho. He began to express those doubts many months ago, long before the present troubles took shape.

In recent weeks he has received a very large number of requests to speak in various parts of the country. He has wisely declined most of these invitations for two reasons. He does not wish to give the impression that he is engaged in a personal campaign against the administration. And he believes that his main criticisms should be delivered from his place in the Senate.

Neither his motives nor his objectives have always been understood. As a result of this misunderstanding, CHURCH often has been cruelly attacked in the press. He has been accused of dividing the country in a time of crisis. It must be added that none of this personal criticism is reflected in the Senate where CHURCH is respected even by those who disagree with him.

The other day CHURCH took the floor of the Senate to protest against one cynical and misleading story that has been given wide currency in the press. He avoided all

references to any story critical of his own record. He was anxious to defend not himself but President Johnson against a deliberate and shameful injustice. This basic point is central to the whole argument.

According to the published story, the President had an angry encounter with CHURCH in the White House after a recent briefing of congressional members on Vietnam.

The President is said to have upbraided the Senator, and in the process to have made a slighting remark about Walter Lippmann, who also has been critical of our policies in Vietnam.

Lippmann is invulnerable to this kind of newspaper gossip and criticism. He needs no defense here. In point of fact, however, no slighting reference was either made or intended by the President. He has the greatest respect for Lippmann. He is also too experienced, too civilized, and too wise to expect Lippmann to agree with him on all issues. During his conversation with CHURCH, the President did indeed make one reference to Lippmann. But he praised Lippmann and certainly avoided any word of derision. This can be confirmed by another Senator and by a member of the White House staff, who both overheard the President's reference.

But Lippmann is a side issue. The real story concerns the two principal figures.

The President and the Senator engaged in an earnest and far-ranging conversation. There was a conversation, not a confrontation nor a clash. CHURCH was not rebuked. He was not threatened with reprisals by the President. He was not promised more patronage for Idaho if he would change his opinions about Vietnam. The two men talked over the situation, failed to agree, and parted as friends.

If CHURCH had considered only his own political interests, he would not have corrected the inaccurate stories. He would have been a popular figure in Idaho, regardless of Vietnam, if the notion had spread that he refused to be bullied by the White House. To his credit, he refused to purchase political advantage at the price of injuring the President. He refused to let a story stand uncorrected when it suggested that the President tried to crush honest dissent by the methods of intimidation and personal hostility. Hence his protest in the Senate.

After the White House meeting, CHURCH wrote to Johnson thanking him for the long conversation which had given him a new insight into the President's objectives.

In a most cordial and eloquent reply, the President commended CHURCH for his courage and independence in the debate on Vietnam. He expressed his admiration for CHURCH'S willingness to testify to his convictions without thinking of immediate popularity. It was a letter worthy in every respect of a great product of the Senate who appreciates the Senate's role in the development of foreign policy and who knows that unity of action does not depend on uniformity of opinion.

Mark Twain said a half-truth can go round the world while the truth is still putting on its boots. The truth has even less chance of overtaking a complete lie. But these are the facts. They do honor both to Johnson and CHURCH, and they deserve to be set down plainly and candidly for the record.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the agricultural conservation program, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 24

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas there is now before Congress S. 408, which includes a provision for a study by the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the cost of a Federal earthquake insurance program; and

"Whereas the Agency study would include all actuarial factors which would be involved in the enactment of a comprehensive Federal natural disaster insurance program; and

"Whereas the State of Alaska and its citizens are particularly aware of the desperate need for the study and program in view of the experience last year with a disastrous earthquake; and

"Whereas with the results of the Alaska earthquake and other natural disasters affecting all areas of the Nation each in mind, there is an obvious need for an insurance program to cover the aftereffects in both the private and public sectors of the economies so damaged: Be it

"Resolved, That Congress is urgently requested to give its approval to S. 408 and the natural disaster insurance program study it provides for; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee; the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee; the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"NICHE GRAVEL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"NADENE WILLIAMS,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"———— ————,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas there exists on the Federal wildlife reservation on the Pribilof Islands of Alaska a form of bondage of American citizens contrary to constitutional concepts of government; and

"Whereas this federally sponsored bondage involves the freedom of assembly, movement, and property of American citizens under a bureaucratic paternalism incompatible with the rights of man; and

"Whereas this situation has its basis in law (sec. 6, Public Law 78–237) as administered by the Department of the Interior; and

"Whereas a citizen may not visit other citizens on the islands without bureaucratic permission in advance and is kept under surveillance while there if he is allowed to visit at all; and

"Whereas a candidate for and now a member of the Alaska State Legislature was denied access to the voters of the islands under these prohibitions; and

"Whereas these and other deprivations of rights warrant investigation and action on the part of Congress; be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and the Department of the Interior are respectfully and earnestly requested to amend the law and rules and regulations pursuant thereto governing control of the islands and the citizen residents thereof to insure that they receive and enjoy the same civil rights and opportunities the Constitution guarantees to all citizens; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Philleo Nash, Commissioner of Indian Affairs; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"MIKE GRAVEL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"NADINE WILLIAMS,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"———— ————,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 23

"Whereas the Nebraska Legislature, in 1947, unanimously approved the Nebraska Reclamation Act which permitted the formation and organization of the 550,000-acre Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District in Buffalo, Hall, and Merrick Counties, to further develop proposals of the multipurpose Mid-State project to utilize a portion of the water of the Platte River, now flowing unused to the Gulf of Mexico; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the 89th Congress, Senate file 303 and House roll 499, which provide for authorization of construction of the Mid-State project by the Secretary of the Interior, under Federal reclamation law, as a unit of the Missouri River Basin project; and

"Whereas legislation for this purpose has been introduced in the Congress of the United States for several sessions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled,

"1. That the legislature memorializes the 89th Congress and the respective interior committees thereof to support the proposals of the Bureau of Reclamation for the $84 million Mid-State project and approve the

above legislation for its authorization and construction.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, of the 89th Congress, to Hon. HENRY JACKSON, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee and Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of the House Interior Committee and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

"PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
"President of the Legislature.
"HUGO F. SRB,
"Clerk of the Legislature."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 21

"Whereas discrimination based upon race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry destroys the rights of citizens to register and vote in local, State, and Federal elections; and

"Whereas such discrimination threatens the rights of all citizens and weakens the foundations of democratic government; and

"Whereas such discrimination requires acts of intimidation, evasion, and equivocation by those who practice it; and

"Whereas such acts violate the spirit and the letter of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled:

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact legislation which will forthwith cause voting discrimination to cease and desist.

"2. That the clerk of the legislature be directed to transmit a suitable engrossed copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
"President of the Legislature.
"HUGO F. SRB,
"Clerk of the Legislature."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to national transportation problems

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas a strong, efficient transportation system is essential to the well-being and defense of our Nation; and the economic stability and growth of the Nation is threatened unless satisfactory, long-range solutions to problems of competition and rates can be found; and

"Whereas regulation of freight rates by all carriers engaged in commercial transportation is necessary to protect the public interest; and it is a matter of national transportation policy that all shippers should be protected from unfair rate discrimination, place discrimination, and size discrimination; and

"Whereas it is desirable and practical to limit the application of the agricultural commodity exemptions and provide the producer the unrestricted right to haul his own produce to market; and

"Whereas to meet nonregulated competition, regulated carriers have disrupted and deviated from the historical wheat-flour rate parity and it is further proposed to cease regulation of rail rates on agricultural commodities—all of which is unjustifiable and discriminatory in its effects on industry in South Dakota and the entire Great Plains area; and

"Whereas it is recognized and attention is directed to the extreme importance of the wheat flour milling industry to the South Dakota economy and as a preferred market for South Dakota wheat producers, providing a ready market for wheat grown in South Dakota each year; and

"Whereas South Dakota produces the finest hard milling wheat and wheat flour in this area and more than 1,800 country elevators and flour milling companies in South Dakota and adjacent thereto contribute materially to the economy of the State of South Dakota; and

"Whereas it is evident that a discriminatory differential in wheat and flour rates threatens the Great Plains area with the loss and relocation of the flour milling industry and associated industries as well; and such changes would be disruptive of a simplified rate structure adapted to the best interests of producers, consumers, railroads, and millers; and

"Whereas the Governor of South Dakota has recognized the threat to industry in South Dakota and the Great Plains area, and has appointed Mr. Lem Overpeck, Lieutenant Governor of South Dakota, as a member of a 10-State committee to promote rate parity on grain and grain products, prevent the effects of deregulation which would be detrimental to industry in the wheat growing area of our Nation, and preserve the flour milling industry in South Dakota and the surrounding States; and

"Whereas in connection with the flour milling industry as a byproduct and by reason thereof, there is available and there is produced large amounts of livestock feed out of the byproducts of said flour milling industry, the loss of which would increase the costs to livestock growers in the State of South Dakota: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we respectfully submit that the effects of deregulation of commodity traffic and the chaos which would result from this action would cause serious dislocation of industry from the Great Plains area and irreparable harm to the economy of our Nation; and that we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for fair and equitable regulation of all modes of commercial transportation and provide the Interstate Commerce Commission with the greater authority needed for full enforcement; and that such legislation should provide for the protection of the interests of the primary producer; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate of the United States, the Governors of Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, Missouri, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Texas, and to each member of the South Dakota delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"CHARLES DROZ,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk.
"LEM OVERPECK,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend to veterans of the undeclared war in Vietnam the Federal benefits that were granted to veterans of the undeclared police action or war in Korea

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas American forces are now engaged in actual conflict in the area of Vietnam which equals in hazard to life, limb, and health of those there engaged with any conflict in which American troops have ever undertaken; and

"Whereas members of the American Armed Forces are carrying out their dangerous assignments as bravely and honorably as those who have fought under the flag of the United States in the great wars, and their hardships and sacrifices, and the hardships and sacrifices of their families, are comparable to those in other major conflicts: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and is, memorialized to extend to veterans of the Vietnam action the educational, retraining, insurance, medical, compensation, and burial benefits and all other benefits under Federal law that were extended to veterans of the action in Korea; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the members of the congressional delegation from South Dakota, and to the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"LEM OVERPECK,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"CHARLES DROZ,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION W–1

"A concurrent resolution opposing proposed charges by the Federal Government for technical assistance to landowners in the field of soil and water conservation

"Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that soil conservation districts charge farmers, ranchers, and other landowners up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished to help design, lay out, and install soil and water conservation practices on their land; and

"Whereas seventy locally governed soil conservation districts in North Dakota which cover the total land area have over a period of years made a most valuable contribution to the agricultural welfare of the state; and

"Whereas the burden of such payments to Federal Government will fall heaviest on our family farms and small operators; and

"Whereas such assessment of payment to the Federal Government will discourage the application of soil and water conservation measures on land so vital to the strength and welfare of North Dakota and the Nation; and

"Whereas requiring farmers and ranchers to pay the Federal Government for such services would place an added drain on the resources of rural America and force more people off the land; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has for some 30 years provided technical help to owners and operators of privately owned lands because it is in the total public interest, and because one of the most urgent national needs is to protect and improve soil and water resources on the privately owned and operated land of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota vigorously opposes any reduction in the Federal participation in such program and the adoption by the Congress of the United States of any system of charging farmers and ranchers for technical help for the application of soil and water conservation work on the privately owned and operated lands in North Dakota and the Nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be sent to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

"ARTHUR A. LINK,
"Speaker of the House.
"DONNELL HAUGEN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"CHARLES TIGHE,
"President of the Senate.
"GERALD F. STAIR,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to national transportation problems

"Whereas a strong, efficient transportation system is essential to the well-being and defense of our Nation; and the economic stability and growth of the Nation is threatened unless satisfactory, long-range solutions to problems of competition and rates can be found; and

"Whereas regulation of freight rates by all carriers engaged in commercial transportation is necessary to protect the public interest; and it is a matter of national transportation policy that all shippers should be protected from unfair rate discrimination, place discrimination, and size discrimination; and

"Whereas it is desirable and practical to limit the application of the agricultural commodity exemptions and provide the producer the unrestricted right to haul his own products to market; and

"Whereas to meet nonregulated competition, regulated carriers have disrupted and deviated from the historical wheat-flour rate parity and it is further proposed to deregulate rail rates on agricultural commodities—all of which is unjustifiable and discriminatory in its effects on industry in Oklahoma and the entire Great Plains area; and

"Whereas it is recognized and attention is directed to the extreme importance of the wheat-flour milling industry to the Oklahoma economy and as a preferred market for Oklahoma wheat producers, providing a desirable market for a substantial part of the wheat growing area of our Nation, and

"Whereas it is evident that a discriminatory differential in wheat and flour rates threatens the Great Plains area with the loss and relocation of the flour milling industry and associated industries as well; and such changes would be disruptive of a simplified rate structure adapted to the best interests of producers, consumers, railroads, and millers; and

"Whereas the Governor of Oklahoma has recognized the threat to industry in Oklahoma and the Great Plains area and has joined with the Governors of the other ten States comprising the Great Plains to promote rate parity on grain and grain products, prevent the effects of deregulation which would be detrimental to industry in the wheat growing area of our Nation, and preserve the flour milling industry in Oklahoma: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Oklahoma Legislature (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That we respectfully submit that the effects of deregulation of commodity traffic and the chaos which would result from this action would cause a serious dislocation of industry from the Great Plains area and irreparable harm to the economy of our Nation; and that we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for fair and equitable regulation of all modes of commercial transportation and provide the Interstate Commerce Commission with the greater authority needed for full enforcement; and that such legislation should provide for the protection of the interests of the primary producer.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit an authenticated copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate of the United States, the Governors of Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, Missouri, Kansas, and Texas, and to each member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"BOYD COWDEN,
"Acting President of the Senate.
"J. D. MCCARTY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE GOVERNOR OF ALABAMA TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS OF ALABAMA TO ASSEMBLE AND TO VOTE

"Whereas the constitutional rights of certain citizens of Alabama to vote and to peaceably assemble are being forcibly repressed by that State, in a violent manner intolerable to freemen; and

"Whereas such forcible repression is in violation of the oaths of office of the Governor of that State, and the public officials acting under him, to support, and defend the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas it is the duty of government to protect the rights of the citizen against abuse and oppression, no matter what its source; and

"Whereas the public authorities of Alabama have been unwilling to assume that duty, and instead appear to be harassing and injuring those who assert their rights, in a manner befitting a totalitarian police state; and

"Whereas the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 makes it clear that the voting rights of our people and their freedom to assemble peaceably shall not be abridged: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, That the public authorities of Alabama be urged to recognize the civil rights of all their citizens, that they subordinate their fears and intolerance to the truth of Christian ethics and precepts and that they take the steps necessary to protect their citizens and preserve their rights before it becomes immediately necessary to interpose further Federal force, and lacking immediate State action, that the President be urged to instruct the Attorney General to take immediate steps to implement the powers of the Federal Government to protect the rights of American citizens, through the use of U.S. marshals and such other law enforcement agents as are legally and properly required to carry out the law and to secure the rights of Americans who find themselves deprived of their basic freedom; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Nicholas Katzenbach, the Attorney General of the United States and the Honorable George C. Wallace, the Governor of Alabama.

"L. L. DUXBURY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Whereas history, science, and the demonstrated individual worth of immigrants from all countries of the world establish that our immigration laws are obsolete. The discriminatory National Origins Act should be repealed and corrective legislation enacted by Congress. To exclude a skilled or gifted person because the country of his birth has a small quota is both undemocratic and wasteful; and

"Whereas this is a nation of immigrants in which citizens of many cultures and ethnic origins live and work side by side to make the American ideal of equality for all men a reality; and

"Whereas immigrants represent less than 25 percent of the total work force. Those entering the labor force have talents and skills which are in short supply in our economy: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to repeal the National Origins Act and that it pass corrective immigration legislation to demonstrate to the world that we believe all men to be equal under law; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Members of Congress from Pennsylvania, and the chairman of the Committee on Immigration.

"ROBERT K. HAMILTON,
"Speaker of the House.
"ANTHONY J. PETROSKY,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that the Soil Conservation Service appropriation for assisting locally organized and locally managed soil and water conservation districts be reduced by $20 million and that soil and water conservation districts and cooperating farmers, ranchers, and other landowners shall pay the Federal Government up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished in the design, layout, and installation of planned soil and water conservation practices on their lands; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has, for some 30 years, provided technical assistance to owners and operators of privately owned lands believing that it is in the total public interest, and one of the most urgent national needs to protect and improve the soil and water resources of this Nation; and

"Whereas over 96 percent of Washington privately owned land is included in its 68 soil and water conservation districts, and nearly a third of Washington's farmers and ranchers are annually using the technical assistance in the design, layout, and installation of planned soil and water conservation measures on their lands; and

"Whereas the supervisors of such districts have continuously requested additional technical assistance to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers to accelerate the application of conservation practices; and

"Whereas recent statewide storms and floods of disastrous proportions have resulted in heavy erosion and loss of valuable topsoil, in heavy sediment deposits in our reservoirs, lakes, streams, and rivers, which also have spread over valuable bottom lands and in other flood damage to both public and private property together with destruction or severe damage to thousands of water control and use structures, requiring greater, rather than reduced efforts in the application of soil and water conservation practices; and

"Whereas such assessments of payments to the Federal Government will discourage and seriously curtail the application of soil and water conservation measures on lands so vital to the strength and welfare of the State of Washington and the Nation and will seriously affect the fall harvest on family farms and the holdings of small operators; and

"Whereas this proposed additional burden added to the costs of farmers and ranchers already in a depressed economic condition, would limit the ability of these people to participate in the existing agricultural conservation program and similar programs, which have in the past contributed substantially to the conservation development, and the prudent use of these soil and water resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, That we respectfully make application to the Congress of the United States to continue the long-established policy of providing technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts and their cooperating landowners and operators without requiring them to pay the Federal Government any portion of cost of such technical assistance; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress provide the increases in technical assistance requested by the soil and water conservation districts in Washington and throughout the Nation to meet the needs of landowners and operators to accelerate the planning and application of conservation measures on their privately owned lands; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chief of the Soil and Conservation Service, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington.

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, in cooperation with the University of Washington, has maintained for 40 years a coal research laboratory and a nonmetallics research laboratory on the campus of the university; and

"Whereas, the Washington State Legislature in 1961 appropriated the sum of $500,000 for a building addition for this facility, which was constructed and in fact just occupied in the fall of 1964, with the understanding that it would remain on the campus of the university; and

"Whereas, the U.S. Bureau of Mines has expressed its intention to move these facilities to Pittsburgh, Pa.; Albany, Oreg., or elsewhere; and

"Whereas, these facilities as now developed, constructed, and installed represent the finest and most advanced research installation of its kind in the United States; and

"Whereas, these facilities and equipment are permanently installed, are extremely bulky and heavy, and do not lend themselves to dismantling and moving, with the obvious end result that a substantial portion of these fine facilities and equipment would be abandoned and lost and, therefore, present capacity to conduct full and meaningful research into future uses of coal and nonmetallics would be lost to this area forever; and

"Whereas, it is extremely vital that at this time when the use of coal as fuel has declined in importance, that research in its future uses be maintained at the highest possible level; and

"Whereas, the uprooting, dismantling, and movement of these permanently installed nonmetallic facilities from an industrial area to the agricultural community of Albany, Oreg., and at the same time moving the also permanently installed coal-research facilities from the Pacific Coast, with 95 percent of these coal reserves occurring in the State of Washington, to faraway Pittsburgh, Pa., with poor access, communication and availability of research for use by industry in Washington, Alaska, or the whole West, will result in tremendous loss to industry and economic development in this State, the Pacific Northwest, and the Nation; and

"Whereas the proposed movement of these facilities following the recent investment made by the State of Washington of $500,000 with the understanding that the facilities would remain on the University of Washington campus would be a breach of faith on the part of the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines; and

"Whereas the closure of the Bureau's facilities on the university campus is presented as being a part of the President's economy program, the fact is that the work cannot be done more cheaply elsewhere, because of the substantial contribution made by the State of Washington through the university and thus the closure would save the Federal Government nothing, but would cost the State a great deal—including a payroll of over $100,000 a year: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Washington, that the U.S. Bureau of Mines be requested to review and rescind its decision to move its Coal Research Laboratory and Nonmetallic Research Laboratory from the University of Washington campus; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State immediately transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the Douglas County Pomona Grange, of Palisades, Wash., relating to the proposed Budget Bureau cut in the agricultural budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the American Legion, southeast district, department of Alaska, protesting against the closing of the Veterans' Administration regional office at Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition, signed by Arthur C. Friss, and sundry other citizens of the United States, favoring the adoption of House bill 3727, the eldercare bill; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Marian E. Molander, of Mount Pleasant, Mich., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"A joint memorial memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States and the congressional delegation of the State of Wyoming in connection with the issuance of a postage stamp commemorating Wyoming's 75th anniversary

"Whereas the government of the State of Wyoming was the first in the world to grant equality to women; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming has played a significant role in the development of the West; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming is justly famed throughout the world for its recreational facilities, including Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming will enjoy the 75th anniversary of its statehood during the year 1965: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring), That it is the desire of the State of Wyoming that a U.S. postage stamp be issued commemorating its 75th anniversary and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the Postmaster General of the United States, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress TENO RONCALIO.

"WALTER B. PHELAN,
"Speaker of the House.
"ANDREW MCMASTER,
"President of the Senate."

"JOINT MEMORIAL 4

"A joint memorial, memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States and the congressional delegation of the State of Wyoming in favor of the issuance of a postage stamp commemorating Grand Teton National Park

"Whereas there was commenced a series of U.S. postage stamps commemorating each of the several national parks; and

"Whereas the series was completed with the exception of a stamp commemorating Grand Teton National Park; and

"Whereas the issuance of such stamp would complete the series and would focus worldwide attention on the beauties of Grand Teton National Park: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring), That it is the wish of the people of Wyoming that a postage stamp be issued commemorating Grand Teton National Park; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the Postmaster General of the United States, to U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, to U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON and to Representative in Congress TENO RONCALIO.

"WALTER B. PHELAN,
"Speaker of the House.
"ANDREW MCMASTER,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Works:

"JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to the scenic road from Rawlins, Wyo., to the Little Snake River Valley in Carbon County, Wyo.

"Whereas the U.S. Government by and through the Bureau of Public Roads in

the Department of Commerce has authorized a scenic roads and parkway study; and

"Whereas the Wyoming State Highway Department is submitting prior to January 25, 1965, a detailed proposal for a scenic road connecting Rawlins, Wyo., and the Little Snake River Valley which passes through some of the most outstanding scenic country in the United States; and

"Whereas this route will direct itself to the general area of the Savery Pothook Dam recently approved by Congress and will provide access to an outstanding recreation area of many thousand acres and provides an outstanding scenic route for those Americans traveling east and west and north and south across this great continent: Now, therefore, it is

"Resolved by the Senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring), That we hereby strongly urge the consideration of this project as the primary project in the intermountain West because of its scenic and utilitarian values during the construction of the Savery Pothcok Dam; it is further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the U.S. Senators from Wyoming, Wyoming's Member of Congress, the Bureau of Public Roads, Commerce Department, and the Wyoming State Highway Department.

"WALTER B. PHELAN,
"Speaker of the House.
"ANDREW MCMASTER,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; ordered to lie on the table:

"JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"A joint memorial, memorializing the 100th anniversary of the heroic death of 1st Lt. Caspar Collins, a member of the 11th Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, who was killed by hostile Indians, July 26, 1865, at the Battle of Platte Bridge Station, later renamed Fort Caspar by the War Department in his honor, 25 years before his name was perpetuated as the name of the city of Casper

"Whereas, 1st Lt. Caspar Collins, age 20, of the 11th Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, was killed in a heroic attempt to save a fellow trooper from approximately 3,000 hostile Indians on July 26, 1865, at Platte Bridge Station; and

"Whereas the city of Casper is required by law to honor this important date in Wyoming history with appropriate services; and

"Whereas July 26, 1965, is the 100th anniversary date of his death, when a diorama depicting the actual battle scene will be dedicated; and

"Whereas the citizens of Casper with all due respect cherish the traditions upon which the city was founded, and do hereby call attention to their city's heroic namesake; and

"Whereas the great State of Wyoming is celebrating its 75th anniversary of statehood; and

"Whereas this anniversary date will add to the history of our State: Now, therefore, it is

"Resolved, by the 38th Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That we acknowledge and express our deep interest in this historic occasion; be it further

"Resolved, That attested true copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Fort Caspar Commission, the city of Casper, our Senators, and Representative in Congress.

"PETER E. MADSEN,
"President of the Senate.
"WALTER B. PHELAN,
"Speaker of the House."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Michael Greenebaum, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1965; and

Michael Greenebaum, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1969.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 1504. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marco Ujkic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1505. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide uniform Federal participation and eligibility standards for benefits payable as medical assistance for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1506. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize grants under the act for community action programs in the field of consumer credit education and consumer debt counseling; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1507. A bill to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; and

S. 1508. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide uniform provisions for crop liens, interest on unpaid marketing quota penalties and the persons liable for such penalties for all commodities for which a marketing quota program is in effect; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 1509. A bill for the relief of lessees of a certain tract of land in Logtown, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1510. A bill for the relief of June J. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1511. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 1512. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that World War II and Korean conflict veterans entitled to educational benefits under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration who did not utilize their entitlement may transfer their entitlement to their children; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1513. A bill to amend the Tucker Act, section 1346(a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, to increase from $10,000 to $30,000, the limitation on the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in suits against the United States for breach of contract or for compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1514. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. James R. Hoy, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1515. A bill to include the construction of an additional span as part of the authorized reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi at Rock Island, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1516. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1517. A bill to protect the right of individuals to register and to vote in State and Federal elections without discrimination because of race or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MCCLELLAN:

S. 1518. A bill to promote an orderly arrangement between the United States and the States with respect to certain regulatory authority involving intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1519. A bill for the relief of Robert Dalby;

S. 1520. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan;

S. 1521. A bill for the relief of Lloyd L. Ward, Jr.;

S. 1522. A bill to remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 1523. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to permit parties to, and persons required to appear in, agency proceedings to be represented by attorneys at law or other duly qualified representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1524. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1525. A bill 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; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1526. A bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS):

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. SIMPSON):

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the qualifications of Members of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CERTAIN CHANGES IN OPERATING FREQUENCY IN STANDARD BROADCAST BAND

Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 88) to express the sense of the Senate on certain changes in operating frequency in standard broadcast band, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN), which appears under a separate heading.)

CONSUMER CREDIT REGULATION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the recent hearings and discussions of the role of the Federal Government in the field of consumer credit regulation have generated great disagreement. I feel sure, however, that there is one aspect of the problem on which all concerned can agree. This is the need for greater understanding by consumers of what credit is, where it is available, its costs, and how to use it wisely?

Since most of the serious consumer credit problems involve the segment of our citizenry whom the President's antipoverty program is designed to help, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to make available under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, grants for consumer credit education and consumer debt counseling to low-income families and ask that it lie on the table for 1 week for cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 1506) to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize grants under the act for community action programs in the field of consumer credit education and consumer debt counseling, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 now provides in section 205(a) that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity may authorize grants to public or private nonprofit agencies for community action programs focused on the needs of low-income families.

This bill would add two new items to the fields in which such programs may he conducted: Consumer credit education and consumer debt counseling.

Consumer credit outstanding at the end of 1964 was just under $77 billion. This credit stems from a variety of sources including banks, credit unions, sales finance companies, consumer finance companies, savings and loan institutions, and various retail stores and dealers. In a society where merchants and lenders are quick to offer new products and methods of financing if they find that consumers desire them, it is to be expected that there would be a great many different consumer credit types. Not only are these types different in their desirability of use for different transactions but they are necessarily different in cost to the consumer. One can not expect to get credit for a $3 purchase in a retail establishment at the same rate of charge as he can get a $20,000 mortgage loan for a home or a $3,000 time payment contract for an automobile. These are not comparable in use, availability, credit charge, or method of credit charge statement, nor need they be.

The important thing is that prospective credit users be familiar with the advantages and costs of each of the various credit types and the sources which are available and most desirable for various purposes.

During the lengthy hearings over the past 4 years on credit legislation on a Federal level, several things have become evident. The most important of these, in my opinion, is the lack of knowledge which was shown by individuals who had difficulties with their use of credit. Repeatedly, those who felt that they had been mistreated admitted that they didn't shop around either for the merchandise purchased or for the most reasonable financing. Indeed few realized that there are a variety of alternative credit sources available. They also admitted readily that they were unaware of any legal protection or of any action that could be taken if they thought that they had been cheated. In most cases, legal action could have been taken if the consumer had known what to do.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not claim that there is no need for additional legislation. Many States have very good credit statutes. Others have need for a great deal of improvement. Due to the complexity of credit laws and regulations that have evolved over the years, it is not simple to develop legislation which will assist consumers in their choices, but which at the same time will not rip asunder the whole credit fabric on which a major part of our prosperity and standard of living rests. Because the field is so complex, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws has undertaken a 3-year study at an estimated cost of $750,000. The study, which has been supported and contributed to by virtually all types of financial institutions, will consider all aspects of consumer credit. It is the goal of the conference to develop feasible methods of disclosing credit costs and provide full complete and workable protection for consumers. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the March 2 issue of the American Banker regarding this study be included at this point.

I am convinced that this study can result in uniform State legislation which will give full protection to consumers while at the same time avoid undue burdens on legitimate business interests.

Improved legislation alone, however, will not be the answer to credit problems in the absence of education. The final conclusion of David Kaplovitz's intensive study of credit problems published in his book, "The Poor Pay More," is that the problem lies not so much in inadequate legal means establishing consumer rights, but rather in the lack of understanding by the consumer and thus his inability to take advantage of his legal rights. It is this deeper and more fundamental aspect of the problem toward which the bill I introduce today is directed.

As one would expect, legitimate lenders and merchants have a great stake in this effort. Perhaps theirs is not an entirely unselfish motive. They know that a customer who thinks he has been dealt with unjustly is not a repeat customer and neither are his friends and acquaintances. Through greater information, consumers will have a natural tendency to avoid gyp operators and patronize reputable merchandising and lending institutions.

Education must be provided for two separate groups. Those who are now in school who will soon be making major credit purchases must be made aware of credit sources, the differences in types of credit, the advantages and disadvantages of each type, and how to make the most effective use of each. Education for these students can be provided in the classroom. Secondly, and equally important, education must be provided for those who are now engaged in purchasing on credit and doing so unwisely. This can be provided in the form of counseling services in each community to assist with present problems and instruction that will assist in the future.

A start has already been made in the education of both of these important groups. Nearly 2,500 cities in the United States and Canada, and some districts in England now have credit education in their secondary schools. This is in addition to the colleges and universities which also have courses. Most of the educational material used in the secondary schools has been provided at the expense of the business community as part of an effort to inform prospective customers of proper credit use.

In addition to the programs in schools for those now attending, the adult population has also been provided with some assistance. In city after city, business and community leaders have initiated programs of consumer counseling. In

most instances, broad community support has been obtained for these counseling services.

As an example of the typical support, in Cleveland, the counseling service board of trustees includes representatives from finance companies, retailing, banking, savings and loan institutions, the trustee division of the municipal court, the AFL–CIO, Family Service Association, and Legal Aid Society.

In Charleston, W. Va., trustees include the legal profession, legal aid, referee in bankruptcy, the press, community council, and labor federation.

In Salt Lake City, credit counseling service trustees include the Salt Lake Credit Bureau, the Utah Credit Union League, medical society, community services council, family service society, better business bureau, legal aid society, and a university professor, in addition to the retailers, financial institutions, and legal profession.

The cooperation of interested parties can result in substantial benefit to the distressed debtor as well as those contemplating credit purchases. The counseling service gives them the guidance and tools required to achieve a level of responsible and manageable debt.

These programs are valuable to the consumer in helping him to more properly use credit if it is desirable for him to use it at all, they will strengthen financial stability in the community, stimulate improvement of business conditions and foster better relationships between the public generally and the private enterprise system of the country.

Consumer counseling services have begun to spread throughout the country after a relatively slow start. In areas where no counseling services yet exist, many business and banking executives are personally handling the cases of individuals who request help.

In addition to this effort, there are thousands of financial and retail establishments which have counseling services for the assistance of present and prospective borrowers.

Despite this organized and individual effort on the part of the business community, there yet remains a great task ahead. Many individuals who are most in need of assistance do not frequent the types of institutions which are providing counseling. Thus they may be unaware of the services available. Even if they were aware of the assistance possibility, they may be reluctant to approach an unfamiliar office.

It is for this reason that I have introduced this bill to make grants available under the Economic Opportunity Act so that the Federal Government may supplement the efforts made by private enterprise and the community in areas where the Federal Government has decided to concentrate its efforts in the war on poverty.

In communities where counseling services are now available, I would wish only to strengthen their programs and provide additional resources to make them more effective and more readily available to those outside the normal channels of assistance.

In communities which do not have consumer credit education and counseling, funds could be available for their support.

Benefits can be immediate for those who are now having difficulty managing their finances, and in the long run, we will have given others the knowledge and ability to handle their affairs without additional assistance. It is also likely that the experience gained will contribute to the work of the National Commissioners of Uniform State Laws in their efforts to analyze needs and draft uniform credit statutes.

This approach will help consumers to help themselves in credit transactions. It will increase their knowledge, and, in the words of the President, it will make them more able to "pursue the excellent and reject the tawdry—in every phase and in every aspect of American life."

TRANSFER OF UNUSED EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS OF VETERANS TO THEIR CHILDREN

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill which would allow World War II and Korean war veterans to transfer any unused educational benefits they might have to their children.

I have been annoyed for some time by the discriminatory treatment some veterans receive under what is commonly referred to as the GI bills because they either completed their education prior to entering the service or they were not in a position to continue it when they were released. Veterans in this category deserved these benefits fully as much as those who were able to take advantage of the education program, yet due to circumstances they usually had no control over, it was impossible for them to receive their just deserts. The bill I am introducing is designed to alleviate this discrimination and enable these veterans to receive the benefits their former comrades-in-arms have long enjoyed. It recognizes and acknowledges the contribution these veterans made in a time of great need. It is also in a spirit of justice that this bill recognizes that the veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict gave up an economically highly productive period in their lives while they served their country. It seems only fair, then, to pass this on to their children.

The demand for higher education in the United States today is unprecedented. Yet neither the schools nor many young people interested in higher education can take advantage of this demand without financial assistance. We live in an age of increasing specialization and technical know-how, both of which promise progress. Yet with an average family annual income of less than $5,500 and a population that has increased 18.4 percent since 1950, financing education becomes a major problem for families. Schools of higher education must be ready for a 1970 student population almost double that of 1960. In 1960 the average number of school years completed by persons 25 years of age or over was 10.6; by 1980 that figure is projected to be 12.2 years. It is the institutions of higher learning which will be noticeably affected. The bill I propose will help the families of over 4 million students and will assist to a significant extent professional, scientific, business, private vocational, junior colleges—a wide variety of institutions of higher education.

President Johnson tells us that the cost of one pupil to attend a private college is $2,400 per year and $1,600 for a public college. This cost is expected to rise by one-third during the next decade. The burden this places on the average family is obviously substantial, particularly when it is realized that there are, statistically, 2½ children in each family.

Under the provisions of the bill I am introducing, each child enrolled in a full-time program of instruction would receive $110 per month as an educational assistance allowance. While this will probably not pay the entire cost it will certainly go a considerable way toward this and will relieve the burdened family's share by about two-thirds. While based on the number of months of education or training the veteran was entitled to receive but did not use, the program of benefits is the same as those set out in the War Orphans Act. This will provide for uniform administration of the program by the Veterans' Administration and will enable it to be effectuated with a minimum issuance of new regulation and establishment of new procedures. It also prevents students from receiving allowances for wives and children. The benefits are limited to programs of instruction, conducted by educational instructions, which are generally accepted as necessary to fulfill the requirements for the attainment of an educational, professional, or vocational objective. This will prevent many of the abuses found in the earlier acts which resulted from the loose practices allowed in these acts because of the failure to limit sufficiently the type programs or schools which could be attended. Educational institution, as used in the bill, is defined as "any public or private vocational school, business school, junior college, teachers' college, college, normal school, professional school, university, or scientific or technical institution, or any other institution if it furnishes education above the secondary school level and is approved by the Administrator."

It will be noted that the child may receive these benefits until he attains the age of 31. This differs from the War Orphans Act which states that the child must have begun the program by his 21st birthday and have completed it by his 23d. This latter act does allow the child to continue until he reaches the age of 31 under certain conditions and in the discretion of the Administrator. I have deliberately omitted the limitations contained in the War Orphans Act. I did so in order to enable the child to utilize the benefits for professional training such as law or medicine or to attend graduate school if he so chooses. These schools are usually more expensive than undergraduate schools. In many cases it is possible for the student to live at home and attend a nearby college for his undergraduate training but he is forced to go away to attend a professional or graduate school because of the

inaccessibility of such a school in close proximity to his home. If this is the case, then, of course, the expense is increased manifold. Another reason for omitting the age limitation is that in many cases a child just out of high school is not mature enough to really know what he or she wants to do, but within 2 or 3 years will realize that he wants and needs to attend college. In this instance the child would probably be a much better student, but would be prohibited because of his age from receiving the benefits which might be the deciding factor in his return to college.

There are approximately 1.9 million veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict who did not use any or who only used part of their educational entitlement. A rough projection of this, based on the census report, shows that about 4.7 million children would be eligible to receive benefits under this bill. I am informed by the Veterans' Administration that there are some 52.9 million months of unused educational benefits remaining. This would mean educational assistance for an average of 11 months for each veteran's child who takes advantage of the program.

Mr. President, the entire blueprint of the Great Society is aimed at raising the economic and educational level of our society to a more equitable plane. Under this blueprint, new methods are being sought to provide more people with the wherewithal to attain a college education. This bill would contribute materially to this end by providing some 52.9 million months of education to almost 5 million young people.

Finally, of less importance perhaps, but of real value is the fact that this legislation would serve to remind and impress the younger generation with the great efforts expended by our Armed Forces these last 25 years, our indebtedness to them, and the appreciation of their country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a section-by-section analysis of the bill, and also that the bill may lie at the desk for 10 days to enable other Senators to become cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the requests of the Senator from Tennessee are granted.

The bill (S. 1512) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that World War II and Korean conflict veterans entitled to educational benefits under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration who did not utilize their entitlement may transfer their entitlement to their children, introduced by Mr. BASS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. BASS is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF BILL TO ALLOW VETERANS TO TRANSFER UNUSED EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO THEIR CHILDREN

This bill would amend title 38 of the United States Code to include chapter 45, entitled "Transfer of Educational Benefits."

Section 2201: Provides that World War II and the Korean conflict veterans who were eligible for education and training under any VA administered law may transfer unused portion of their entitlement to any of his children in any amounts he desires and allows him to modify or revoke the transfer. In case the veteran is incompetent or deceased the other parent or guardian may transfer the benefits.

Section 2202: Limits the benefits to programs conducted by educational institutions with a predetermined educational, professional, or vocational objective. Defines "educational institution" as the usual college, business or vocational school, or professional, technical, or scientific institution.

Section 2203: Reduces the period of entitlement by the number of months that a veteran received vocational rehabilitation from the VA.

Section 2204: Provides that the child may receive the benefits from age 18 or when he finishes secondary education until age 31 with the exception that if he is above compulsory school attendance age then in the discretion of the administrator he may begin earlier.

Section 2205: Insures that no child shall be eligible for benefits of this nature under two VA programs.

Section 2206: Provides that the Administrator shall pay to the parent or guardian of each eligible person applying an educational assistance allowance, but limits it to the period of enrollment and prohibits any allowance from being paid where the student is not pursuing his course in accordance with the rules and regulations of the educational institution he is attending. Prohibits also the payment when the absences exceed 30 days in a 12-month period while the institution is in session. Requires that the Administrator receive certification of enrollment and attendance. Provides that the allowance be paid within 20 days after certification if practicable.

Section 2207: Allows $110 per month if student is enrolled full time; $80 per month if enrolled three-quarters time; and $50 per month for half-time enrollment. No benefits are payable for less than half time study. If it is an alternate work-study program of enrollment then the allowance is $90 per month, in which case the student must be enrolled full time.

Section 2208: Allows the benefits to be transferred without regard to the expiration of time limitations.

Section 2: Technical amendment relating to numbering.

Section 3: Effective date is the 1st day of the 2d month following enactment.

RELIEF OF 1ST LT. JAMES R. HOY, U.S. AIR FORCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to relieve 1st Lt. James R. Hoy, U.S. Air Force, from all liability for repayment to the United States the sum of $1,167.73, representing the amount of overpayments of basic pay received by him for the period from January 2, 1962, through January 30, 1965.

This indebtedness was incurred as a result of erroneous information supplied to him by personnel of the Financial Services Division at Larson Air Force Base, Wash., and on two occasions by the Accounting and Finance Center at Denver, Colo. This information led him to believe that his previous 3 years and 10 months of active duty in the U.S. Naval Reserve placed him in a category of a commissioned officer, credited with over 4 years active enlisted service, and entitled him to additional monthly pay. Based upon this information, he accepted additional monthly pay during the period mentioned above.

Lieutenant Hoy received his Air Force Reserve Commission on November 22, 1961, and was processed to active duty on January 2, 1962. He was paid in accordance to the pay scale of second lieutenant with over 6 years creditable longevity.

Upon his arrival at Larson Air Force Base on June 13, 1963, the personnel of the Financial Services Division informed Lieutenant Hoy after a review of his record that he was to be reimbursed $410 for underpayment backdated to January 2, 1962. He then requested that his records be sent to the Air Force Accounting and Finance Center at Denver, Colo., to be computed and a judgment rendered before he would accept payment. This was returned approximately 2 weeks later, and as no error was discovered he accepted the back payment and his records were adjusted to the correct pay scale. Due to a feeling of caution, he again requested a record check by Denver on November 20, 1964, the results of which were negative.

The error in payment was later discovered by personnel at Larson after the second record check by Denver had been returned. The Chief of the Financial Services Division at Larson has since been advised by Denver of the overpayment, and instructions were issued to take collection action.

If Lieutenant Hoy is required to reimburse the United States for this error, which was caused by no fault of his own, it will create a serious hardship financially on him, his wife, and five children.

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

The bill (S. 1514) for the relief of 1st Lt. James R. Hoy, U.S. Air Force, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ROCK ISLAND CENTENNIAL BRIDGE, ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to include the construction of an additional span as part of the authorized reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.

The purpose of this bill is to further amend the act approved March 18, 1938, which authorized the city of Rock Island, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island. Under the provisions of the bill the improvements shall be commenced not later than April 1, 1970, and shall be completed within 3 years after such date.

The act of March 18, 1938, was further amended by Public Law 682, 84th Congress, approved July 11, 1956, and Public Law 85–629, approved August 14, 1958.

The act of March 18, 1938, authorized the city of Rock Island to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River from Rock

Island, Ill., to Davenport, Iowa, in accordance with the provisions of an act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters, approved March 26, 1906.

The Rock Island Centennial Bridge was completed in 1940, and since that time the average daily traffic over the bridge has increased from 4,000 to nearly 15,000 vehicles per day.

The metropolitan area of Rock Island and Moline, Ill., Davenport, Iowa, and adjacent cities, has a total population of over 200,000. The area is highly industrialized, with an estimated 130 industries and about 30,000 employees on the Illinois side, and 180 industries with about 15,000 employes on the Iowa side. Being one metropolitan area, the traffic across the river produced by this employment is extremely heavy on the bridge.

Steps should be taken now to permit the Centennial Bridge to be utilized to its designed capacity to relieve the existing and anticipated traffic conditions. If this is not done, the economy of the area will be adversely affected and the movement of the highway traffic impaired.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report of the Rock Island Centennial Bridge Commission setting forth the annual traffic over the bridge from 1960 through December 1964 and the net receipts during the same period from tolls collected.

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

The bill (S. 1515) to include the construction of an additional span as part of the authorized reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi at Rock Island, Ill., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The report presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

Yearend report for the Rock Island Centennial Bridge Commission ending Dec. 31, 1964

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Vehicles:					
Passenger cars-trucks	4,485,121	4,233,066	4,500,470	4,767,193	5,248,358
Buses (city lines)	52,101	48,039	47,347	46,673	48,692
Total vehicles	4,537,222	4,281,104	4,547,917	4,813,871	5,297,050
Revenue:					
Gross receipts	$522,995.20	$494,609.27	$527,393.55	$558,506.55	$616,951.79
Maintenance costs	210,551.41	201,071.23	218,372.41	231,500.17	244,299.54
Net receipts	312,443.79	290,538.04	309,021.14	327,006.38	392,652.25
Bonds outstanding as of Dec. 1 [1]	4,536,000.00	4,486,000.00	4,604,000.00	4,501,000.00	4,388,000.00
A and B bonds due to be called Apr. 1, 1965					50,000.00
Annual interest to Mar. 31, 1965	191,675.00	186,901.00	197,431.50	193,989.00	185,228.50
Cash on hand as of Dec. 1 at the Rock Island Bank & Trust Co. as deposited by the Rock Island Centennial Bridge Commission	265,599.49	234,679.80	259,614.73	274,883.81	303,536.19

[1] $250,000 additional bonds sold in March 1962, revising total of outstanding bonds to $4,736,000. Bonds retired during the year 1962, $132,000; balance outstanding, $4,604,000. Retired in 1963, $103,000; balance outstanding, $4,501,000. Bonds retired during 1964, $113,000 and balance of bonds outstanding is $4,388,000.

NOTE.—The above figures include an estimated figure for the month of December 1964, as we do not as yet have these figures available. However, they are estimated on past year's business and will be well in line.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes. It is being introduced at the request of the Acting Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1965.

According to the Acting Administrator, the purpose of this bill is to permit greater economy, safety, and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of Federal buildings by authorizing the General Services Administration to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years. An identical bill (S. 1233) was introduced in the 88th Congress, reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations. It passed the Senate, but failed to be acted upon in the House.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Acting Administrator of General Services, dated February 5, 1965, which sets forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1516) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1965.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee is a draft bill prepared by the General Services Administration to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for the 89th Congress, 1st session.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to permit greater economy, safety, and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of Federal buildings by authorizing the General Services Administration to enter into contracts necessary for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years .

The fixed equipment systems intended to be covered by the proposed legislation together with comments justifying enactment of the proposal are set forth in more detail in the attachment hereto.

With respect to the fiscal effects of the enactment of this proposal, it is believed that substantial savings would inure to the benefit of the Government. However, the extent of these savings cannot be measured at this time because long-term contracts for such services have not been consummated in the past.

For the reasons stated above, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

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

Sincerely yours,

LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.,
Acting Administrator.

ATTACHMENT

The fixed equipment systems intended to be covered by this measure include heating, refrigeration, ventilating, air conditioning, electrical, vertical transportation, plumbing, fire protection, watchman, fuel, and pneumatic tube systems installed in Federal buildings. Typical items common to these systems are the following: boilers, stokers and oil burners; compressors, chillers, and cooling towers; fans, airhandlers, and induction units; transformers, motors, generators, high-voltage switchgear and interior distribution wiring; pumps, piping, and water tanks; fire alarms and watchman central recorders; fuel tanks, and lines; blowers and tube stations; and elevators and escalators. Such systems are relatively complex and costly and require continuous inspection, maintenance, and repair (when necessary) of such a character that they can be operated efficiently, with the greatest possible safety, with a minimum of service interruption, for the longest possible time economically justifiable.

A substantial part of the servicing of this equipment is subject to being performed for the Government by contracting with firms which specialize in the various aspects thereof. It would be very advantageous to the Government if more of this servicing could be contracted out. There are several reasons for this. For one thing, the Government in

many localities has been unable to employ, or to retain for any length of time those employed, the necessary number of specially trained skilled craftsmen, and supervisors with know-how, to perform the work because of local labor market conditions. For another, by contracting for this work the Government is relieved of the added costs and difficulties inherent in purchasing, transporting, and storing innumerable spare parts and other supplies which would otherwise be necessary, as well as arranging for the availability of such spare parts and other supplies promptly when and where needed in the many Federal buildings throughout the country, not infrequently on an emergency basis. For a third, even assuming that the Government could obtain and retain the necessary skilled craftsmen at all locations, the amount of such service work required at any given time for any given Federal building varies to such an extent that it would be most difficult, if not impossible, in many small isolated locations, to schedule the work so that the skilled craftsmen employed by the Government would be fully employed on the one hand, or that, on the other hand, there are sufficient skilled craftsmen available to handle the work on other occasions when unpredictable and urgent heavy demands for their services may arise to service particular buildings. For these reasons and because of other problems, some of which are indicated hereinafter, the usual practice of private industry is to enter into long-term contracts with specialty firms for such services.

Under present law, Government contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of such equipment may be entered into for only 1 year. It is believed that authority to contract for a longer period will yield lower costs and more efficient and satisfactory service and operations.

It has been our experience that many contractors do not fully carry out their obligations under 1-year contracts with us for equipment inspection, maintenance, and repair, as hidden deficiencies in such maintenance show up later, often after the contract has expired and a new contractor is on the job. Because of their inherently latent nature, it is most difficult to prove whether the deficiencies in performance under such contracts are attributable to one short-term contractor or to another, at least to the extent that the Government can obtain appropriate damages or other relief in a court of law, or before an administrative tribunal, for the failure of a contractor to properly perform such a maintenance contract. As one consequence, the Government has had to bear the cost of remedying such deficiencies. Another consequence has been that our equipment has not been operable, because of shutdown time for repairs, more frequently and for longer periods than it should be. Thus, we have been handicapped in properly protecting the Government's interests.

Another somewhat different type of situation which has confronted us is that contractors will refrain from bidding on a 1-year contract when they have knowledge under an existing contract that abnormal maintenance will probably be required during the ensuing year.

It is considered that authority to enter into contracts to service this equipment for a maximum of 5 years will do much to alleviate this type of situation, as most major defects in maintenance will show up in a 5-year period. Under a 5-year contract, the contractor will have a much greater incentive to perform proper maintenance during the early years of the life of equipment than under a 1-year contract. And, under a 5-year contract, even if a contractor neglects the maintenance during the early years, his neglect can much more easily be charged against him than it could be under a 1-year contract, as such a contractor could not sit back with the thought that the Government would have great difficulty in proving that he, rather than his successor contractor, was responsible therefor.

Another benefit to the Government which would flow from the grant of authority to enter into such 5-year contracts is that, in many cases, lower prices could be obtained under one contract for 5 years as contrasted with those obtainable under five contracts for 1 year each.

Under the longer term contract, contractors would be able to arrange for longer range, bigger volume purchasing of supplies and spare parts, and otherwise more economical operations. An important fringe benefit would be the greater time a contractor's personnel would have to become acquainted with the characteristics of the particular pieces of equipment which were being serviced, including the relationship of such equipment to the structural and other characteristics of the buildings in which it is located, or in connection with which it is used, and the detailed nature of the circumstances under which it must be operated. Each new contractor under an annual contract arrangement has to organize for the job and train his employees for the particular tasks required by the contract, thus sacrificing to some extent the efficiency that results from experience in actually performing the work.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia.

This bill is the same measure that was reported to the Senate by the District of Columbia Committee on July 8, 1964. As we all know, that measure languished on the Senate Calendar until the adjournment of the 2d session of the 88th Congress. After being reported, it never again saw the light of day.

Within the last several days, the FBI has released the Uniform Crime Report for 1964. It shows that the number of serious crimes in the District during 1964 increased 25 percent. This was reported by the Washington Star on March 10, 1965. I ask unanimous consent to insert the entire article at this point in the RECORD.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME UP 25 PERCENT; U.S. LIST ALSO RISES

The number of serious crimes in Washington last year increased 25 percent, according to nationwide crime statistics released today by the FBI.

The FBI's Uniform Crime Report for 1964, issued by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, showed that serious crime in seven major categories was 13 percent higher last year than in 1963 throughout the Nation.

In Washington, serious offenses totaled 22,932 in calendar 1964, 4,603 higher than the 1963 total.

Only one category of crime recorded by the FBI dropped in the Washington area in 1964. This was aggravated assault, with 2,605 recorded cases, against 2,851 reported the previous year.

Other categories of crime in the Washington area, compared with 1963, are: murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, 132 against 95; forcible rape, 96 against 87; robbery, 2,279 against 1,707; burglary, breaking or entering, 8,910 against 6,984; larceny of $50 or more, 3,518 against 3,140, and auto theft, 5,392 against 3,465.

A Washington police official noted that Washington ranked fourth in crime rate among 16 American cities in the 500,000-to-1-million population group in 1964.

According to the FBI Crime Index, Washington's crime rate—the ratio of total offenses to population—was exceed by only three cities: St. Louis, which had the highest rate, San Francisco, and New Orleans.

In the robbery-by-force-and-violence category, Washington had the highest rate among the 16 cities.

Monthly crime reports issued by Washington police show reported crimes under a part I (serious crime) heading. Unlike the FBI Uniform Crime Report, the part 1 offenses include petty larceny (involving sums under $50), purse snatchings, and statutory rape.

Using these part I crime categories, crime summaries issued by police here resulted in a larger number of total offenses for calendar 1964 (30,660 offenses) but a smaller percentile increase than that reflected in the FBI report. Crime in the District last year—according to the District summaries—increased by 17.5 percent over 1963.

Across the Nation, in crimes of violence, there was a 9-percent rise in murder, 18 percent in aggravated assault, 19 percent in forcible rape, and 12 percent in robbery.

Auto thefts rose 16 percent, larceny of $50 or more increased 13 percent, and burglary 12 percent.

Also released today was the Metropolitan Police Department's latest crime summary, for last month. The report showed the number of part I offenses in the District was 1.5 percent higher last month than the total for February 1964—the 33d consecutive month in which such increases were reported.

A total of 2,421 part I offenses were recorded during the report month, 36 more than in the corresponding month last year.

Police officials noted in passing that there were 29 days in February 1964—a leap year—while this year, February contained 28 days. Therefore, based on a comparison of daily averages, last month's crime exceeded the crime incidence in February 1964, by 4.9 percent.

Last month, the report stated, increases were reported in four crime categories in comparison with February 1964, as follows: rape, up one offense (an increase of 9 percent); robbery, up 26 (8.7 percent); housebreaking, up 134 (20.1 percent); auto theft, up 64 (15.1 percent).

The following decreases were reported: aggravated assault, down 63 (28 percent); grand larceny, down 19 (6.9 percent); petty larceny, down 107 (17.4 percent).

Ten homicides were reported in the District last month—the same number recorded in February 1964.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the article points out that, according to the FBI crime index, the District's crime rate is exceeded by only three American cities of comparable size. This is distressing news, indeed, but it only bears out the fears of the Senate District Committee in its report on this same bill last July.

The bill contains six titles and is the product of much study, analysis, and deliberation by the committee. A section-by-section analysis of the bill is contained in Senate Report No. 1172 of last year on pages 25 through 28, and I ask unanimous consent to have that analysis reprinted at this point.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

TITLE I

Section 101 is a brief restatement of existing law with respect to the admissibility of voluntary confessions and statements made by an accused.

Section 102 restates existing law and excludes statements made by an accused after a period of unnecessary delay and prior to an appearance before a U.S. Commissioner.

Section 103 provides that under section 102 of this title, delay alone shall not cause the exclusion of any statement obtained by interrogation of the accused, if (1) the accused was warned that he need not make a statement and was told that any statement made could be used against him; and (2) the accused was told of his right to notify a relative or friend and consult with any attorney and he, in fact, was given an opportunity to contact a relative or friend and talk with a lawyer of his choice; and (3) the statement was completed within not more than 6 hours after his arrest; and (4) all of these warnings whenever reasonably possible and any questioning of the accused were witnessed by a third party or transcribed or recorded verbatim.

Section 104 requires the trial judge who admits any statement in evidence pursuant to section 103 of this title to make findings of fact concerning the existence of the conditions set out in section 103.

Section 105 authorizes and directs the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate regulations including necessary disciplinary measures to assure that police officers comply with requirements of law set out in this title and with the regulations made pursuant to it.

TITLE II

Section 201 of the bill amends section 24–301 of the District of Columbia Code relating to insane criminals by adding a new subsection (i). This subsection provides that insanity shall not be a defense in any criminal proceeding in the U.S. district court or District of Columbia court of general sessions, unless the accused or his attorney in such proceeding files with the court and serves upon the prosecuting attorney, written notice of his intention to rely on such defense.

The notice is required to be filed at the time of entering a plea of not guilty, or within 15 days thereafter, or at such time thereafter as the court may for good cause permit.

TITLE III

Section 301 amends section 4–144 of the District of Columbia Code relating to detention of material witnesses.

The section provides that members of the Metropolitan Police Force and the Federal law enforcement officers are authorized, without unnecessary delay, to take before a judge, or U.S. commissioner of the District of Columbia, any person whom the officer has reasonable grounds to believe is a material and necessary witness to the commission of a crime punishable by imprisonment for 1 year or more, and when there is a reasonable probability that such person will not be available to testify at the trial of the person charged with the offense.

Immediately upon being taken before a judge or commissioner, such person shall be advised of his constitutional rights and shall be allowed reasonable opportunity to consult counsel. After a hearing is afforded, and pursuant thereto, a person is determined to be a material and necessary witness, such person will be required to post bond or collateral as security that he will appear and testify at such trial. Upon his failure to post bond or collateral, the judge or commissioner may order his further detention in suitable quarters that are separate and apart from those used for the confinement of persons charged with crime. Under the section, the judge or commissioner retains authority to release any person detained for an unreasonable period of time whether or not he has discharged his duties as a material witness.

Also the section affords the prosecution the same right with respect to the taking of a deposition of a material witness as is afforded to the defendant. In those instances of where a person, through financial inability, cannot post bond or collateral, the court may discharge such person where the deposition of the person has been taken.

TITLE IV

Section 401 of this title amends section 22–3201 of the District of Columbia Code which defines crimes of violence. This section adds the crime of robbery to the abovementioned section of the District of Columbia Code.

TITLE V

Section 501: Section 501 of this title amends District of Columbia Code, section 22–501, to provide a minimum sentence of not less than 2 years for assault with intent to commit crimes of violence.

Section 502: Section 502 of this title amends the District of Columbia Code, section 22–1801, which defines and provides penalties for the crime of housebreaking. This section establishes or defines the crime of burglary, in two degrees, and the punishment to be applied.

Subsection (a) of this amendment defines burglary in the first degree as a breaking and entering, or entering without breaking, any actually occupied dwelling or room used as a sleeping apartment in any building with the intent to take property or commit any criminal offense. Burglary in the first degree shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 2 years nor more than 20 years.

Burglary in the second degree is defined in subsection (b) as breaking and entering or entering without breaking into other enumerated premises with the intent to take property or commit any other crime. The penalty for burglary in the second degree shall be imprisonment for not less than 1 year nor more than 15 years.

Section 503: Section 503 of this title amends the provisions of District of Columbia Code, section 22–2901, by increasing the minimum penalty for crimes of robbery from a minimum of 6 months to a minimum of 2 years.

Section 504: Section 504 of this title amends District of Columbia Code, section 22–3202.

Under existing law, permissive additional penalties are provided for where an accused is armed with a firearm when committing a crime of violence. Thus a person armed when committing a crime of violence would be subject on conviction, to an additional sentence for a term of not more than 5 years; for second convictions an additional sentence of not more than 10 years; for a third conviction an additional sentence of not more than 15 years; and for a fourth and subsequent conviction an additional sentence of not more than 30 years.

The amendment to this section adds certain other dangerous or deadly weapons, other than a firearm, for which a person may be given an additional penalty if he commits a crime of violence while armed with any such weapon.

Section 505: Section 505 of this title amends District of Columbia Code, section 22–2001, relating to indecent materials.

Subsection (a) of the amendment provides that whoever sells, offers to sell, or gives away or has possession with intent to sell, give away, or exhibit indecent materials, or who advertises such materials or drugs or instruments intended to produce abortion or gives or participates in or advertises any indecent public exhibition, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Subsection (b) of this amendment provides that whoever with knowledge engages in the production of obscene materials which are to be disseminated shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Subsection (c) of this amendment provides that the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia may petition the U.S. district court for a preliminary injunction and a permanent injunction to restrain the sale, dissemination, distribution, and production of obscene matter prohibited in this section. A hearing will be provided prior to the issuance of any preliminary injunction which will remain in effect for no more than 30 days.

Subsection (d) of this amendment provides that after trial of the issues the court may issue a permanent injunction and that such injunction shall include a provision for the immediate seizure and impounding of the obscene matter. There is provision for final disposition of such obscene matter in such way as the court may determine. However, in no event shall the matter be destroyed until after finality of appeal.

Subsection (e) provides that proceedings shall be governed by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, except as they may be inconsistent with the provisions of this section.

Subsection (f) provides an exemption to the provisions of section 505 to those licensed under the provisions of the Federal Communications Act while engaged in activities regulated pursuant to such act.

Section 506: This section of title V amends District of Columbia Code, section 22–3105, which provides penalties for the use of explosives with intent to destroy or damage property. The amendment to this section provides a minimum sentence of not less than 3 years and leaves the existing maximum sentence at 10 years.

Section 507: This section of title V adds a new section to the District of Columbia Code relating to the making of false or fictitious reports to the police department. This section codifies the substance of existing regulations of the Metropolitan Police Department relating to such offenses and provides that the penalty shall be a fine not exceeding $300 or imprisonment not exceeding 30 days.

TITLE VI

The purpose of this title is to make clear that the bill has no retroactive effect.

Offenses committed prior to its enactment are not intended to be affected in any way by any amendment to existing law made by the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it is the middle of March and we have not yet received proposed legislation dealing specifically with crime in the District of Columbia. I do not contend that this bill is the whole answer to the District's crime problems, but it seems to me that it is an excellent proposal to begin with. Time is growing short and we know that the House has already reported a District of Columbia crime bill. I think we ought to get started on a bill of our own and get some action at the earliest opportunity.

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

The bill (S. 1526) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION TO BE HELD IN TULSA, OKLA., IN 1966

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Oklahoma, a joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held in Tulsa, Okla., from May 12 through May 21, 1966.

Tulsa, Okla., is the oil capital of the world. The International Petroleum Exposition which it has sponsored over the past two decades has contributed much to the dissemination of information and products developed in this country to foreign nations with undeveloped oil and gas resources. The exposition has been attended in the past by representatives from over 50 nations throughout the world.

The exposition is a place where leaders of the oil industry from every continent can gather to discuss their common problems, exchange useful information and ideas, and evaluate the latest developments in technology and equipment. I am confident the exposition to be held next year will prove even more successful and beneficial than those in the past.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 63) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF SENATE ON CERTAIN CHANGES IN OPERATING FREQUENCY IN STANDARD BROADCAST BAND

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I submit, for myself and the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee [Mr. SPARKMAN], a resolution which expresses the sense of the Senate that the Federal Communications Commission should not adopt or promulgate rules to permit any radio station operating on a frequency in the standard broadcast band to operate on a regular or other basis with power in excess of 50,000 watts.

Mr. President, this resolution is, in effect, a reaffirmation by the Senate of Senate Resolution 294, 75th Congress, 3d session, which the Senate passed in 1938. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that resolution be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. RES. 88

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that the operation of radio-broadcast stations in the standard broadcast band (five hundred and fifty to one thousand six hundred kilocycles) with power in excess of fifty kilowatts is definitely against the public interest, in that such operation would tend to concentrate political, social, and economic power and influence in the hands of a very small group, and is against the public interest for the further reason that the operation of broadcast stations with power in excess of fifty kilowatts has been demonstrated to have adverse and injurious economic effects on other stations operating with less power, in depriving such stations of revenue and in limiting the ability of such stations to adequately or efficiently serve the social, religious, educational, civic, and other like organizations and institutions in the communities in which such stations are located and which must and do depend on such stations for the carrying on of community welfare work generally; and be it further

Resolved, That it is therefore the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that the Federal Communications Commission should not adopt or promulgate rules to permit or otherwise allow any station operating on a frequency in the standard broadcast band (five hundred and fifty to one thousand six hundred kilocycles) to operate on a regular or other basis with power in excess of fifty kilowatts.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there appear at this point in the RECORD a copy of House Resolution 714, 87th Congress, 2d session, dated June 27, 1962, which states that, notwithstanding the Senate resolution of 1938, it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the FCC may authorize the use of power in excess of 50,000 watts on any one of the 25 class I–A clear-channel frequencies in the standard broadcasting band, if the Commission finds that such action will serve the public interest, convenience, or necessity.

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

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Communications Commission—

(1) may, notwithstanding Senate Resolution 294, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, adopted June 7, 1938, authorize the use of power in excess of fifty kilowatts on any of the twenty-five class I–A clear channel frequencies in the standard broadcast band (five hundred and forty to sixteen hundred kilocycles) which are specified in the rules of the Commission, if, after consideration of all pertinent factors, including the objective of providing improved nighttime radio service to substantial areas and populations presently receiving inadequate nighttime radio service, the Commission finds that operation on such frequencies with power in excess of fifty kilowatts will serve the public interest, convenience, or necessity; and

(2) should not authorize, for a period of one year from the date of adoption of this resolution, the construction for nighttime operation, or the nighttime operation, of any station on any of the twenty-five class I–A clear channel frequencies in the standard broadcast band (five hundred and forty to sixteen hundred kilocycles) which are specified in the rules of the Commission, unless such station was or could have been authorized consistent with the rules of the Commission then in effect, to operate on such a frequency on July 1, 1961.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, there are now pending before the Federal Communications Commission several applications by so-called class I–A clear-channel stations to increase their power from the present 50,000 watts output to 750,000 watts. There are several reasons why the Federal Communications Commission should not authorize such a great increase in power for these stations.

For example, the United States has treaties with such countries as Canada and Mexico to protect their radio channels from interference by U.S. stations. If the FCC should increase certain stations to 750,000 watts, it would not be possible, I am told, to protect these foreign channels from interference, and thus we would be unable to honor our treaties with neighboring countries.

Additionally, and most importantly, authorization of higher power by the FCC would result in an undesirable concentration of economic control in the hands of a few stations. These superpower stations would be in a position to attract national advertisers away from the smaller radio stations around the country. As a member of the Senate Small Business Committee, I am seriously concerned about the very likely adverse economic impact that would be felt by the smaller stations.

On November 14, 1964, the Florida Association of Broadcasters adopted a resolution which reads, in part, and I quote:

Resolved, That the Florida Association of Broadcasters joins many other State associations, independent industry groups (the Association of Broadcasting Standards, Daytime Broadcasters Association, etc.) in registering unconditional opposition to this proposed granting of "superpower" by FCC.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Florida Association of Broadcasters resolution dated November 14, 1964, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission is now considering the granting of power as high as 500,000 watts for the 12 remaining class I clear channel stations; and

Whereas seven radio stations that presently operate with the maximum of 50,000 watts have requested licenses to operate with as much as 750,000 watts; and

Whereas the granting of superpower of this order to these stations, or to any clear channel station, would give them a dominant voice in the radio medium in dissemination of news, information and viewpoints, and an overall competitive advantage in coverage, listeners, and potential advertising revenues; and

Whereas this action would result in widespread interference with the signals of smaller stations, and in severe adverse impact on the income and local public service potential of smaller stations everywhere; and

Whereas under the existing radio allocations system which has provided diverse media in medium and smaller sized communities in all areas of the country, this action is unnecessary and unwarranted, even for purposes of emergency defense communications: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Florida Association of Broadcasters joins many other State associations, independent industry groups (Association of Broadcasting Standards, Daytime Broadcasters' Association, etc.) in registering unconditional opposition to this pro-

posed granting of "superpower" by FCC; and further be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Federal Communications Commission, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the Committee on Commerce of the U.S. Senate, to the Members of Congress from the State of Florida, and to any other appointed or elected officials or groups interested in this action.

Done at Clearwater, Fla., Saturday, November 14, 1964, by the board of directors, Florida Association of Broadcasters, Inc.

BERNARD E. NEARY,
President.

Attest:

KENNETH F. SMALL,
Secretary.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I submit my resolution in support of the Florida broadcasting industry, and in support of all radio stations around the country whose economic interests are vitally at stake in the proceedings now before the Federal Communications Commission. I hope the Senate will favorably consider this resolution.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 88) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Whereas on June 7, 1938, the Senate adopted S. Res. 294, Seventy-fifth Congress, which stated that for reasons listed in such resolution it was the sense of the Senate that the Federal Communications Commission should not adopt or promulgate rules to permit or otherwise allow any radio station operating on a frequency in the standard broadcast band (five hundred and fifty to one thousand six hundred kilocycles) to operate on a regular or other basis with power in excess of fifty thousand watts; and

Whereas events since the date of adoption of such resolution have not changed the reasons for such resolution, and any such operation with power in excess of fifty thousand watts would not be in the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it continues to be the sense of the Senate that the Federal Communications Commission should not adopt or promulgate rules to permit or otherwise allow any radio station operating on a frequency in the standard broadcast band to operate on a regular or other basis with power in excess of fifty thousand watts.

AMENDMENT TO EDUCATION BILL TO CORRECT EDUCATION AID WEAKNESSES (AMENDMENT NO. 53)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and myself, an amendment to the pending primary and secondary school education-aid bill, S. 370, which bill is now pending before the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member.

The measure would amend title I of the bill to increase the number of children receiving educational opportunity under the act by about 60 percent in the second and third years after enactment, under a matching fund formula, by directing aid to children from families with an annual income between $2,000 and $3,000.

The amendment is designed to meet three principal objections to title I. These objections were pointed out by witnesses during the recent hearings before the Education Subcommittee.

The objections are: First, the aid formula for the second and third years is open, leaving the determination of how funds are to be distributed up to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, rather than to the Congress; second, there is no matching provision; and, third, under the inadequate poverty "yardstick" of $2,000 annual family income, only about 11 percent of all school-age children are reached.

I send the amendment to the desk, ask that it be printed, and appropriately referred.

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

The amendment (No. 53) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 3, line 7, strike out "KINDS AND".

On page 3, line 12, beginning with the comma after "1968" strike out all to the period in line 15.

On page 6, beginning with line 18, strike out all through line 2 on page 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the 'Federal percentage' and the 'low-income factor' shall be 50 per centum and $2,000, respectively, and

"(2) for each of such two succeeding fiscal years, an additional amount shall be determined using a 'Federal percentage' of 25 per centum and a 'low-income factor' of $3,000 but more than $2,000, and added to the basic grant, if such amount is matched by State or local funds, or both, to be used for the same purpose as such basic grant.

Any amount contributed by a State for the purpose of clause (2) shall be in addition to regular payments of State aid made by such State, and any amount made available by a local educational agency for the purpose of such clause with respect to any fiscal year shall represent an increase in such year in current expenditures of local funds for elementary and secondary school education by such agency over the amount of such expenditures in the previous fiscal year."

On page 7, beginning with line 15, strike out all through line 5 on page 8, and redesignate sections 205 on page 8 through section 212 on page 16, and cross references thereto, accordingly.

On page 8, line 8, strike out "or a special incentive grant".

On page 12, line 20, beginning with "plus the maximum" strike out all to the period in line 22.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, under the administration proposal, the educational program is carefully outlined for the first year after enactment, but becomes cloudy for the second and third years. This presents budgeting and planning problems to local educators. This poses problems to the Congress which, in undertaking this great new program, should not be restricted to looking only 1 year ahead.

Under the amendment we are introducing today, the formula for the first year would stand as presently written, with each State receiving a Federal grant equal to 50 percent of the current average annual per pupil expenditure, multiplied by the number of children from families of under $2,000 annual income. This formula would continue to apply for the second and third years for the under-$2,000 income children. However, during the second and third years, children from families in the $2,000 to $3,000 annual income category would be brought in under a matching formula providing for a Federal contribution of 25 percent of the average annual per pupil expenditure, where this is matched by an equal amount from State and/or local funds.

Under our amendment, therefore, the number of children directly affected would be increased by about 60 percent—from some 5 million to some 8 million children—with a great improvement in educational opportunity, while Federal cost for title I would be raised only about one-third. In this way the bill could much more effectively serve its purpose of fighting poverty and aiding a substantial added number of the school population who need it badly.

To illustrate how our amendment would work, consider a State with an average annual per pupil expenditure of $450—the national average is $455. For each of the 3 years authorized for S. 370, that State would receive a Federal grant of $225 for every child between 5 and 17 from a family with an income of $2,000 or less. In addition, for each of the second and third years of the operation of the education bill the State would receive a Federal grant of $112.50 for each child from a family with an income of from $2,000 to $3,000, providing that amount is matched from State and/or local funds. Thus, an additional $225 a year would be directed to the child from the $2,000 to $3,000 income family, as well as to the child from the under $2,000 income family.

Our amendment substitutes a matching program for the incentive provision contained in S. 370. Special comment at this point is necessary with respect to this incentive provision. What is not generally realized is that this provision, as the administration intends to enforce it, turns the education bill for its second and third years into a measure which may work out to give first priority to the more financially able school district and to give secondary priority to funds for the educationally deprived and the poverty ridden. The incentive section provides that where a school district increases its expenditures over the previous year, the Federal Government would match that increase up to 5 percent. Thus, the available appropriation would go first to the school districts which had increased spending; then what is left over would be distributed to those school districts with poverty-related children.

Our amendment would not be affected should the Senate adopt the amendment added by the House Education and Labor Committee to include some 250,000 children from families with over $2,000 annual income who are receiving aid-to-dependent-children payments. As a

matter of fact, our proposal would be more beneficial to the States with lower per capita income than the House proposal because only in the more affluent areas are there substantial numbers of families with over $2,000 annual incomes who receive ADC benefits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table which indicates the amount that could be received by each State under this amendment.

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

Distribution of funds under proposed amendment to title I, S. 370

	Estimated total amounts, fiscal year 1967	Estimated basic amounts [1]	Estimated additional amounts [2]
50 States and District of Columbia	$1,399,412,576	$1,035,045,502	$364,367,074
Alabama	39,465,644	31,397,950	8,067,694
Alaska	2,237,338	1,707,842	529,496
Arizona	12,631,270	9,560,000	3,071,270
Arkansas	28,102,209	22,142,767	5,959,442
California	88,028,978	64,129,478	23,899,500
Colorado	11,479,633	8,130,765	3,348,868
Connecticut	,330,450	6,690,300	2,640,150
Delaware	2,923,805	2,128,780	795,025
Florida	42,197,658	29,621,770	1 ,575,888
Georgia	49,401,083	37,240,335	12,160,748
Hawaii	2,898,308	1,980,484	917,824
Idaho	3,478,115	2,352,730	1,125,385
Illinois	58,610,972	42,893,697	15,717,275
Indiana	26,914,108	19,331,480	7,582,628
Iowa	23,024,028	16,633,008	6,391,020
Kansas	14,695,956	10,130,574	4,565,382
Kentucky	37,891,638	30,472,362	7,419,276
Louisiana	51,695,105	39,709,164	11,985,941
Maine	5,750,407	3,710,000	2,040,407
Maryland	19,931,878	14,134,803	5,797,075
Massachusetts	19,351,464	13,252,800	6,098,664
Michigan	45,260,842	33,607,470	11,653,372
Minnesota	27,966,514	20,210,298	7,756,216
Mississippi	37,797,396	31,750,310	6,047,086
Missouri	37,369,036	27,816,224	9,552,812
Montana	5,928,000	4,275,000	1,653,000
50 States and District of Columbia—Continued			
Nebraska	$10,641,828	$7,324,982	$3,316,846
Nevada	1,261,797	895,136	366,661
New Hampshire	2,254,560	1,495,780	758,780
New Jersey	26,646,542	18,998,190	7,648,352
New Mexico	12,041,013	9,024,525	3,016,488
New York	121,581,395	84,214,395	37,367,000
North Carolina	62,557,677	48,800,066	13,757,611
North Dakota	6,880,142	4,919,036	1,961,106
Ohio	49,919,261	36,736,395	13,182,866
Oklahoma	21,018,191	15,427,449	5,590,742
Oregon	10,241,432	7,226,016	3,015,416
Pennsylvania	63,155,432	44,354,682	18,800,750
Rhode Island	4,805,643	3,494,943	1,310,700
South Carolina	34,037,116	27,348,774	6,688,342
South Dakota	8,935,722	6,815,622	2,120,100
Tennessee	41,144,025	32,054,100	9,089,925
Texas	102,890,403	76,546,602	26,343,801
Utah	3,672,463	2,583,636	1,088,827
Vermont	3,183,939	2,009,700	1,174,239
Virginia	42,092,980	31,842,860	10,250,120
Washington	14,431,751	9,986,067	4,445,684
West Virginia	21,139,732	16,954,132	4,185,600
Wisconsin	22,969,036	15,801,300	7,167,736
Wyoming	2,257,411	1,495,523	761,888
District of Columbia	5,291,250	3,685,200	1,606,050

[1] Distribution estimated on the basis of the 5–17 population in families with incomes of less than $2,000 per annum (1959) and 50 percent of the estimated 1964–65 current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance (ADA).

[2] Distribution estimated on the basis of the estimated 5–17 population in families with incomes of $2,000 to $2,999 per annum (1959) and 25 percent of the estimated 1964–65 current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance (ADA).

AMENDMENT OF RULES RELATING TO CLOTURE—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 54 AND 55)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I submit two amendments, one to Senate Resolution 6 and the other to Senate Resolution 8, which I understand have been reported to the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I ask that the amendments be printed and that they also be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The amendments were ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 54

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MILLER to the resolution (S. Res. 6) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate (rule XXII), by striking lines 23–25 inclusive on page 2 and lines 1–2 inclusive on page 3 of said S. Res. 6 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifths of the Senators present and voting and also by a majority of the Senators affiliated with each of the two major political parties present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of."

AMENDMENT No. 55

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MILLER to the resolution (S. Res. 8) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate (rule XXII), by striking lines 8–13 inclusive on page 2 of said S. Res. 8 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn and also by a majority of the Senators affiliated with each of the two major political parties present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of."

QUALITY STABILIZATION ACT—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1484, the Quality Stabilization Act which I introduced on March 10, be permitted to remain at the desk until March 24.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have added to S. 309, a bill which has twice before passed the Senate, to establish a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matter and Materials, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have added as a cosponsor of S. 1232, the so-called Freedom Academy bill, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY].

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

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

Authority of March 4, 1965:

S. 1364. A bill to amend section 4005 of title 39, United States Code, relating to fraudulent, false, or misleading and lottery mail matter, and for other purposes: Mr. FONG.

S. 1377. A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. MUNDT.

S. 1380. A bill to provide for the control of obnoxious aquatic plants in navigable and allied waters: Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 1382. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 with respect to wages paid for certain types of work pursuant to such act: Mr. THURMOND.

S. 1383. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 with respect to certain political activities thereunder: Mr. THURMOND.

Authority of March 1, 1965:

S. Res. 83. Resolution to create a select committee to study gold production in the United States: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. RANDOLPH.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON CLOSING OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL FACILITIES

Mr. HOLLAND. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, of which

I am chairman, will meet again on Friday, March 19, in room 1114 in the New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m., to hear Members of Congress, representatives of organizations, and other interested persons, in regard to the proposals made by the Secretary of Agriculture to eliminate lines of research and to close various agricultural research stations.

The committee has already conducted extensive hearings on each research station and line of research proposed to be eliminated in the announcement of Secretary Freeman of last December 31. The hearing record of 519 pages has been issued in committee print and copies are available at the Committee on Appropriations. Following the further hearings on March 19, the complete hearing record will be reissued in one volume, but I thought it advisable to have the record of the hearings to date made available because of the widespread interest on this subject.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 290 AND S. 291

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, for myself, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that hearings will be held by the subcommittee on S. 290, to protect the integrity of the court and jury functions in criminal cases and S. 291, to effectuate the provisions of the sixth amendment of the U.S. Constitution requiring that defendants in criminal cases be given the right to a speedy trial.

The hearings are scheduled for March 29, at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building, and for March 30, in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to these measures should communicate with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1446, TO RESERVE CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS FOR A NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce for the information of the Senate that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled a hearing for April 13 and 14 on S. 1446. This is the bill to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System.

This legislation was submitted to the Congress by the executive branch of the Government in a message from the Secretary of the Interior on March 3. In his February 8 message on natural beauty, the President recommended the establishment of a national wild rivers system. He included it as an important part of his effort to protect and preserve the beauty of America, as outlined in his message.

The hearings will begin at 10 a.m. on April 13 in room 3110, New Senate Office Building. This announcement is made for the purpose of giving notice to Members of the Senate and all others who may wish to testify at our hearing.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HAROLD LEVENTHAL TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, March 22, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Harold Leventhal, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit, vice Wilbur K. Miller, retired.

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 Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

REVIEW OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE EFFORTS TO REDUCE BARRIERS AND EXPAND BEEF EXPORTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Small Business Committee has been studying ways of expanding exports of U.S. beef and beef products, and I believe a brief summary of our activities is in order at this time.

Since the committee first became interested in this subject in late 1963, a threefold approach has been taken. First, we have sought to identify and analyze the barriers standing in the way of our small and large businessmen seeking to enter this trade. Second, the committee sought to bring the representatives of interested industries and Government agencies together in a cooperative atmosphere conducive to resolving such problems. Third, we hoped to foster among these parties arrangements for broadening American participation in the long-term commercial market possibilities for beef abroad.

As this body is aware, the Small Business Committee has devoted consistent effort over the past 5 years to small business opportunities in international trade. It has been clear that this was a field of golden opportunity for the American business community—during the past 15 years, while our gross national product doubled, world trade almost tripled—from $57 to $154 billion in merchandise alone, exclusive of services. As a result of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Foreign Credit Insurance Act, the Mobile Trade Fair Act, the creation of an Export Expansion Council and other legislative and administrative action supported by the members of our committee, the United States should be in a position to participate fully in the new surge of world trade which promises to be even greater over the next 15 years.

Yet, as a nation, I do not believe that we have been as export minded as our competitors. It might surprise many people to know that while the United States exports 5½ percent of our gross national product, Great Britain exports 20 percent, Canada exports 31 percent, and Belgium exports 34 percent of their GNP's. It might thus be said that the United States has been in the "minor leagues" of international trade.

Our committee found that this inferior status applied with particular force to beef and beef products. The importance of this commodity was underscored by President Johnson's farm message on February 4, 1965, which pointed out that one-third of all farm income results from the sale of meat animals. Most of our ranchers and farmers, as well as 70 percent of our meatpackers, are small, independent businessmen. Domestically, the beef industry is a small business success story—the United States is the world leader, with approximately 40 percent of total production. In my State, for instance, the cattle industry is a $100 million a year industry, and could reach $200 million yearly by 1970. Alabama ranks 20th in the Nation in the total production of beef cattle with over 1,400,000 head, valued at $150 million. As an exporter of meat, however, we face the fact that the country ranks only 12th.

The committee thus began its research into barriers which might be artificially frustrating this trade. In the area of ocean freight costs we found that rates from the United States to Europe were twice, and more, what they were from meat producing countries in South America to Europe. This was despite the fact that distances from South America to Europe are 2,000 to 3,000 miles longer.

With this background, the committee convened public hearings on ocean freight rate and other possible barriers to beef exports on February 24 and 25. We received testimony from Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman; the Chairman of the Presidential Beef Commission to Europe, Mr. Jay Taylor; and the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, Adm. John Harllee, as well as numerous representatives of the beef, shipping, and other transportation industries.

As one of the immediate results of the hearing, I am pleased to announce today that the American steamship companies and major international conferences—which are associations of steamship lines—servicing Western Europe have initiated rate reductions on beef and beef products. The reductions becoming valid today on the gulf coast complete a series of rate reductions during the past 25 days, which average over 20 percent, and cover most of the categories of beef which move by sea to the European market.

As this is a matter of considerable interest to the beef industry, I will, in the interest of clarity, describe these reductions in some detail.

First. Rates on boxed beef going to Britain were reduced by gulf shipping lines by 13 percent—from $76.25 to $66.50—for the period February 18 until March 31.

Second. Boxed boneless beef destined for the Continent was reduced by two of the major conferences in the North Atlantic by 12 percent—from $75 per ton to $66—and 27 percent—from $96 per ton to $66—effective February 24.

Third. Gulf port rates on boneless, bone-in, and ground beef were cut between 20 and 32 percent—from $76.25 or $94 per ton to $63.75—on March 3, with no termination date.

Fourth. The French-Atlantic conference reduced the rate on hanging, chilled beef by 25 percent—from $190 per ton to $142.50—effective March 4.

Fifth. On March 4, also, the North Atlantic-Continental conference voted similar action on the rates from the United States to Antwerp—a 19-percent reduction—from $180 per ton to $142.50—and from the United States to German ports—21 percent—from $198 per ton to $156.50—effective March 10.

Sixth. Today, March 15, rates from the gulf ports followed suit, being reduced on chilled, hanging beef to all French and German ports by 18 percent—from $190 to $156.50.

As we are aware, it is often necessary in Congress to wait for a considerable period before the effects of a committee inquiry become apparent. In this case, the Senate Small Business Committee is gratified at the timely efforts of our American-flag steamship companies in proposing these reductions and in securing their adoption by the conferences. This has been a responsive and responsible course of action.

The significance of a breakthrough in an export areas such as beef is indicated by the fact that more than one-half of our States border on seacoasts or the seaways, and can benefit directly from increased maritime trade.

For information, I would like to include the following list of the 20 largest U.S. ports, and the current volume of their shipping activity:

Tonnage shipped through 20 major U.S. ports[1]

[Calendar year 1963: Short tons (2,000 pounds)]

	Million tons
Port of New York and New Jersey	154.7
New Orleans, La	79.1
Houston, Tex	55.8
Philadelphia, Pa	46.6
Norfolk, Va	44.1
Baltimore, Md	43.1
Duluth, Minn	41.5
Toledo, Ohio	40.3
Chicago, Ill	37.3
Beaumont, Tex	30.9
Baton Rouge, La	30.2
Detroit, Mich	29.2
Port Arthur, Tex	28.7
Los Angeles, Calif	20.3
Boston, Mass	19.7
Corpus Christi, Tex	19.2
Indiana Harbor, Ind	19.1
Mobile, Ala	19.0
Texas City, Tex	19.0
Portland, Maine	18.7

[1] Source: Waterborne Commerce of the United States, United States Army Corps of Engineers, calendar year 1963.

For ports that stand at the apex of fine river systems, such as New Orleans and Mobile, the future seems especially bright with promise.

As to the value of these cargos, a ton of general cargo in export averages in the neighborhood of $1,000. A ton of beef, for example, is worth about $850. For the quantity of beef needed to supply the present estimated shortage in Europe, 50,000 to 200,000 tons, the total price would be between $45 million and $170 million.

Plainly, movement of 100,000 or 200,000 tons of beef a year would generate a good deal of healthy economic activity and jobs in the fields of shipping, insurance, finance, warehousing, and transportation, as well as in the various segments of the beef and livestock industries.

There is little question that our balance of payments would be favorably affected, particularly to the extent that the U.S. merchant marine becomes the carrier of this commodity.

It is true that the new ocean freight rate reductions now in effect constitute only a first step in this direction. We are constrained to view this step with caution. Some of the reductions are temporary and others are tentative, in the sense that little or no beef cargos have yet moved over these routes. The maritime industry has many cost pressures upon it, and we will have to follow the future course of these new levels very carefully. Whether such reductions are effective must be tested by the impersonal laws of Western European marketplaces—it will be proved ultimately only by whether more U.S. beef is sold in Europe.

Of course, this standard also involves other potential barrier areas such as market development, tariffs, nontariff procedures, regulations, port facilities, which were raised at the hearing. These factors remain to be explored and will be explored. However, I believe that this round of freight rate reductions constitutes a necessary and helpful first step toward fully competitive conditions for the beef industry and for the Nation.

It indicates a recognition by our steamship companies of the benefits to be gained by cooperating with American exporters in developing the profit opportunities presented by export markets.

In the words of John H. Griffith, who represented the 21 companies of the American Steamship Traffic Executives' Committee:

> We believe that considerably more beef can be exported than at present; we also believe that the American steamship industry can be a partner (in this expansion).

In this case, the emphasis is upon beef and beef products moving to Western Europe. However, if this approach proves successful, there might be wider implications.

A glimpse of this potential is indicated by the fact that Western Europe alone contains 366 million people—including 176 million in the increasingly prosperous Common Market. By 1980, this total is expected to grow to 420 million. The per capita consumption of meat in these areas is just about one-half the U.S. figure.

Of course, developing this market, and supplying it with American beef, will not be short or easy work. However, the committee's approach to the task was, I believe, aptly reflected by Commentator Durward Shields in the March issue of Livestock Market Digest. He wrote:

> Now would be the time to do these things, while Europe has a meat shortage. * * * The Government-industry team in an export program of such vast potential requires recognition and mutual helpfulness (as to the respective roles of Government and industry).

Our committee believes that the work will be made shorter and easier, and that the job can be done, with all of U.S. industry and Government working together in this way.

A beginning of the breakthrough has, it would seem, been made. The committee commends all of those whose cooperation and hard work have brought us to this point. We hope that American teamwork will consolidate and advance this breakthrough, and can translate it into a substantial expansion of beef exports in the months ahead.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 8:25 P.M. TONIGHT AND THEN ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until 8:25 p.m. this evening.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. At that time, the Senate will meet, and, in a body, will proceed to the floor of the House of Representatives, where the President will address a joint session of Congress concerning the need for voting legislation. I understand that those in authority would like to have us in the Chamber of the House of the Representatives by 8:40 p.m.

I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the President's statement to the joint session of Congress, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

MINORITY VIEWS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the minority report of the Special Committee on Aging being submitted to the Senate today deserves careful attention.

I submit a summary of some of its recommendations so that all Members of the Congress can be aware of its contents and the desirability of giving serious consideration to its conclusions.

Senators FRANK CARLSON, WINSTON L. PROUTY, GORDON ALLOTT, JACK MILLER, and JAMES B. PEARSON join me as members of the committee responsible for its minority report.

Challenging the trend toward public welfare treatment of senior citizens, the minority report of the Senate Special Committee on Aging proposes an 11-point approach to needs of older Americans.

Emphasizing the importance of income for older persons as the basis for independence and dignity, the minority views recommend that appropriate legislative committees of the Congress give productive consideration to proposals which would amend the Social Security Act so as to—

First. Increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, especially minimums.

Second. Extend OASI benefits to persons past 72 who are not now covered.

Third. Eliminate or liberalize the restriction on how much a social security beneficiary may earn without penalty.

Fourth. Assure adequacy of old-age assistance programs.

Fifth. Increase social security's flexibility by providing for actuarially sound increases in monthly benefits to persons choosing deferment of participation until an age subsequent to 65.

It also urges that rapidly growing private pension plans be given every encouragement.

The minority statement emphasizes the importance of protecting those on fixed incomes from "the erosion of purchasing power which accompanies inflation created by excessive spending and manipulation of the tax structure."

Recognizing special problems encountered by a number of older people, the minority report proposes:

First. Study of changes in elderly housing administration to assure reduced rents envisioned by Congress when it authorized low-interest direct loans.

Second. Simplification of the medical-assistance-for-the-aging program.

Third. Careful evaluation of additional health proposals with emphasis on "values in State administration, private enterprise, and voluntary efforts."

Fourth. Encouragement of States to make full use of Federal assistance available for them to help older people.

Fifth. Immediate steps to help finance adequately the costs of "sheltered care" for those whose infirmities require such service.

The minority statement gives particular attention to dangers in Government-operated programs. It cites specific instances in housing and medical assistance programs of disregard of congressional intent by staff of the Federal executive branch charged with implementing them.

Assignment by the present administration of Health, Education, and Welfare Department responsibilities for aging activities to its Welfare Commissioner is criticized.

The minority statement recommends, further, that the Senate Special Committee on Aging undertake study of older persons' budgetary requirements under varying living situations as a base for public policy development.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, SENATE CHAPLAIN

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, many articles are written about Congress, but one of the most gratifying was written by Jack Anderson and appeared in the Sunday newspaper magazine, Parade, issue of March 14.

The article is about our honored and revered Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris and his wife, Helen, and is entitled, "Man of God on Capitol Hill."

Dr. Harris is more than a Chaplain of the U.S. Senate; he is a true friend, a counselor, and is beloved by all.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appear at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

MAN OF GOD ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Though the Bobby Baker affair has left a blot on the Senate, there is one man eager to testify in defense of its Members and morals. For two decades, he has shared their daily lives. No one has a deeper insight into their secret lives.

He is the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the gray, craggy Senate Chaplain, who is worried that sensational headlines have given the public the wrong impression of the Senate. Interviewed by Parade, he knitted his shaggy brows and spoke with deep feeling: "No other group of men has higher ethical standards. I mingle with them. I hear their confidences. They don't deserve most of the attacks made on them."

Though Dr. Harris doesn't deny that there are black sheep in his famous flock, he declares defiantly that the majority give more devoted service, work longer hours, and adhere to higher standards than their constituents.

To to the public, the Chaplain is a dignified, dark-clad figure who opens the Senate session with a daily noontime prayer. But to the 100 members of his unique parish, Dr. Harris is more than a functionary. Into his tiny, cluttered office, the Nation's mighty come to discuss their ethical and spiritual problems.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, after leaving the Senate, wrote the Chaplain: "You have provided a source of strength, courage, and comfort to me for more years than I care to remember. Remember I do, however, and the memory is a fond one that shall never die."

Barry Goldwater recently wrote him: "I think by far the most satisfying experience of my 12 years in the U.S. Senate was the rare opportunity to meet and know you. You were not only brilliant in your presentation of prayer, but you carry out the thoughts in the way you live."

CAMPAIGN ISSUE

The Chaplain's deep-set eyes flashed fire as these treasured letters brought to mind the bombshell that the Very Reverend Francis Sayre, dean of Washington Cathedral, let fly from the pulpit during the recent presidential campaign. The dean declared that the voters had a choice between stupidity and immorality, insinuating that President Johnson lacked moral fiber and that Goldwater lacked depth. Dr. Harris was incensed.

Most Senators have strong spiritual values, says Dr. Harris. They consult him about the propriety of Senate measures. They consider his daily prayers as much a part of the legislative process as the passing of bills. Some not only heed his prayers but read them aloud to their families.

Pointing at random, Dr. Harris scattered his praise over the Senators whose pictures cover the walls of his cubicle. "There," he said, indicating an autographed picture of Alabama Democrat JOHN SPARKMAN, "is a fine and fair man." In quick succession, the Chaplain also called Kansas Republican FRANK CARLSON the salt of the earth, spoke of Virginia Democrat WILLIS ROBERTSON'S strong spiritual undergirding, described Ohio Democrat FRANK LAUSCHE and Wyoming Republican MILWARD SIMPSON as men of strong convictions. He admired Illinois Democrat PAUL DOUGLAS and New Jersey Republican CLIFFORD CASE.

The Chaplain even had a good word for Bobby Baker. Though Dr. Harris expects to be criticized for saying so, he pleaded that the much maligned wheeler-dealer is not as bad as portrayed. "I wrote Bobby a note in the midst of his troubles to let him know I had not lost confidence in him."

British-born Dr. Harris, son of a minister, married Helen Louise Streeter, daughter of a minister, in Brooklyn 50 years ago. Together, they served Methodist congregations in Long Branch, N.J., and New York City. In 1924, they were assigned here to historic Foundry Methodist Church. Dr. Harris was elected Senate Caplain during the Roosevelt years, has served continuously in the post except for 2 years in the late forties, when the late Peter Marshall replaced him.

Great moments in history are routine for Dr. Harris. The most memorable came in late November 1963 when he received a midday call that President Kennedy had been shot. The Chaplain was asked to come to the Capitol immediately. "The place was in an uproar," Dr. Harris recalls. "Senate leaders MIKE MANSFIELD and EVERETT DIRKSEN asked me to offer a prayer. I called upon the Senators to rise for a minute of silence, partly because of the gravity of the tragedy but partly to give me a minute more time to think of something to say."

A LORDLY CEDAR

He selected as the theme a few lines from friend and poet Edwin Markham: "And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down as when a lordly cedar, green with boughs, goes down with a great shout upon the hills, and leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

Like the Senators he serves, Dr. Harris does not hesitate to speak his convictions. Sometimes they find expression even in his prayers. Recently, he sounded a bold warning for the benefit of his friend, the President. Referring to the Great Society, the Chaplain wrote: "A fatal fallacy of so many rose-tinted social schemes is to regard Government as a sort of escalator upon which even the indolent may be carried up to desired levels whether they personally exert themselves or not. Far too many people are perfectly willing just to recline on the moving stairway while they, themselves, do little but enjoy the sensation and the scenery."

Dr. Harris is ready with wit as well as wisdom. The late Vice President Alben Barkley once asked the Chaplain for a story and was given an anecdote about a young minister preaching his first funeral. Flustered, he forgot to invite friends to pass the coffin for a last look, but remembered at the end of the ceremony and blurted: "The congregation can now pass around the bier." Barkley loved that one and told it often.

Humor is only one of the ways the lawmakers reveal themselves to their Chaplain. Few are better equipped to judge their moral integrity. No one has been more eloquent in their defense.

Mr. CARLSON. Every week Dr. Harris writes an article, under the byline "Spires of the Spirit," which appears in the Washington Sunday Star and other newspapers. Last Sunday his article was entitled "Tomorrow Will Be Too Late." It stressed the devoted and dedicated service of the late Peter Howard, who was truly a world leader in the moral rearmament movement.

Dr. Howard's untimely death recently in Lima, Peru, was mourned by millions of citizens in every country on the globe. He was truly a great religious leader.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TOMORROW WILL BE TOO LATE

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

Last fall, with a message that burned like fire in his bones as a flaming meteor, Peter

Howard, world leader of the moral rearmament movement, swept across America's spiritual skies. From mid-November to mid-December he spoke at 17 universities and colleges, pouring out his message in all parts of the United States and Canada. Long before the end of this itinerary 53 other colleges were clamoring for him to come to their campuses. There came also the urgent call from yeasty South America, "Come over and help us." The decision was to go south. In that crucial valley of decision during these first months of 1965 he has been holding high the blazing torch. Now the almost unbelievable news has stunned millions that Peter Howard's lips are forever silent. Death has claimed him. Under all skies there is lamentation and a sense of unutterable loss because of the sudden passing of this dynamic prophet who was captured by a cause, who was the herald of an idea whose time has come.

This English-born ambassador of the inner life and of the changed individual was truly a citizen of the world. As his still body lay in state in the city hall of Lima, Peru, the window-filtered sunshine flooded the black mahogany casket surrounded by banks of floral tributes. For 13 grief-packed hours, awed crowds passed by. To their country and to the outside world a stirring message was broadcast from a group of students from the university and the high school. In that poignant hour this was the message of these young people: "The world has lost a great man. His message reached the depths of humanity. His light will not go out. It will still shine in his plays, his writings, and in the innumerable lives he changed."

On all the continents Peter Howard, with his burning zeal, became the pattern of manhood at its best. He fought to cure corruption, injustice, bitterness, and oppression. He died in the battle to create a world in which no one suffers hunger, where each has a decent dwelling place and the opportunity for an adequate education. These students of Peru declared in their message to their own country and to the outside world: "The whole history of humanity will be upturned because we of the young generation vow to take on the task of Peter Howard and make it our own." We feel, because of the steeples of faith that this dedicated man reared in all parts of this revolutionary world, that this message should be a megaphone to broadcast some of his exact words. In this spire, he being dead yet speaketh. Hear ye him in his recorded words which he entitled "Tomorrow Will Be Too Late":

"My interest is a revolution involving not just the West, but the world and everybody in it. It will not be accompanied by moral platitudes which are scattered so lavishly at election time. It will not be accomplished by atomic force which, if it spreads and is unleashed, must destroy civilization as we know it on this planet. It will be accomplished by an explosion, a thunderstorm of the human heart, created by men and women who realize that the modernization of man is the great task of our time.

"You cannot change society by beginning with a superstructure. You have to begin with the foundation. The foundation of society and of civilization is men.

"Unless we face the fundamental challenge of our times, unless we decide once and for all that Almighty God and His absolute morality are to reign on this earth, rather than almighty man and his relative amorality, our children's children will certainly be Red and we shall experience a totalitarian tyranny across the earth that will make Hitler's mass butchery look like a picnic in a park.

"There is nobody more reactionary than the individual who wishes to see the world or the country different but is unwilling to change himself.

"Let me tell you what I mean by the ideological battle. I mean a battle to win men—win them, not buy them. I mean a battle which depends not on what we say, but what we do, how we live, and what we live for. This is ideology. A man living such a life breathes, talks, works, fights 24 hours a day to win men to the idea which motivates him. Most of us in the West consider that this is standard operating procedure for a Communist; but if a Christian or a Jew does it we often call him a fanatic or an extremist.

"Without the success of this revolution liberty will be expunged from the annals of history, perhaps for a thousand years. Indeed, man may destroy himself because his moral and spiritual growth failed to match the giant tools of destruction which his intellectual and mental growth have created."

And now the great heart who uttered these words is gone. Greatheart is dead. But

"His name
Shall kindle many a heart to equal flame,
The fire he kindled shall burn on and on,
Till all the darkness of the lands be gone
And all the kingdoms of the earth be won,
And one!
A soul so fiery sweet can never die.
But lives and loves and works through all eternity."

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, at the request of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

NO "HEAD TAX ON FOREIGN TRAVEL," PLEASE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is very difficult for me to justify the pronouncements of administration leaders saying to American citizens in substance "Stay home and do not spend any money overseas" at a time when the same administration is proposing to continue sending billions of dollars overseas for economic and military aid for foreign countries. Personally, I cannot arrive at any conclusion that it is wrong for Americans to travel abroad and spend money they have saved for trips overseas for recreational and cultural purposes.

Americans spend on foreign travel more than $1 billion a year more than foreigners spend in this country. The Congress appropriates money to promote tourism in the United States. Railroad and bus lines cooperate by offering special rates for foreign visitors. We simplified visa application forms, but one of the forms infuriated foreigners. It was a requirement that an alien state that he or she was not coming to our country for immoral purposes. This was insulting. Now some dimwit in the State Department, apparently seeking to close the gap on what Americans spend abroad and what foreigners spend here, proposes a direct tax of $100 a trip on Americans leaving our country for a foreign destination. Whether or not Canada, Mexico, and the Bahamas would be excluded, no one knows. I do not take this too seriously. Of all shortsighted, harebrained schemes, this one is fantastically outrageous. Perhaps this is a trial balloon. If so, the person who inflated it should deflate that brain child or brainless child without delay. We should do everything we may properly do to encourage foreigners to visit us. It would be ruinous to us throughout the world were we to restrict travel of our citizens at a time when we are sending Peace Corps representatives the world over, and when more and more Americans are saving money looking forward to vacations in foreign lands. Let us instead ask railroad and bus line officials to favor American vacationers with the same low rates they offer foreigners.

GREAT SOCIETY GOING FOR BROKE?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Columnist Jenkin Lloyd Jones in a recent article referred to Senate Joint Resolution 30, introduced jointly by my colleague, Senator CURTIS, and me, as a "snowball-in-hell bill."

Obviously, Mr. Jones believes our measure to restore fiscal integrity to our Government has less chance of withstanding the heat of the congressional crucible than does the proverbial snowball. He may be right.

I am convinced he is right in his suggestion that "all the talk about a richer and fuller life for the common man" in the Great Society is "meaningless without a high degree of fiscal honesty and integrity."

Mr. Jones' column is a sobering one. It will be of little comfort to the holders of what he calls the "new think" which "has it that the national debt may be ignored, that 'controlled inflation' is necessary to provide maximum employment, and that as long as the gross national product in terms of dollars keeps rising, everything is hunky-dory."

Mr. Jones' column is a challenging one. We are dared to contemplate the time when we approach what he terms the "point of no return":

Things begin to happen fast. Prices rise faster than wages. Investors flee from bonds or demand fantastic interest rates. Common stock prices go into orbit and people rush to buy tangible things like land and jewels. All who lent money in good faith are ruined.

No one suggests, Mr. President, that we are now at such a point of no return. But the signs are ominous. The cost of living index, a reliable barometer of inflation, is at an alltime high. More Americans lost their homes through foreclosures last year than at any time since before World War II. Gold continues to move abroad. Again last year our adverse balance of international payments exceeded $3 billion.

It is not, I repeat, not too late. We in the Congress have it within our power at least to curb the sharp upward trend in Government spending.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, it will be my purpose to do all I can toward this goal.

But it is not enough to reduce the appropriations requests of the agencies.

We must think in fiscal terms when we consider the grandiose schemes of the Great Society.

Else we run the ruinous risk so graphically portrayed by Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the column by Mr. Jones from the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Great Society Going for Broke?"

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I, too, was taken with the Jenkin Lloyd Jones column and wish to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Nebraska.

I commend a close and thoughtful reading of the column to my colleagues and I am delighted that Senator HRUSKA has brought it to our attention.

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

GREAT SOCIETY GOING FOR BROKE?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Can a nation that boasts about its prosperity tolerate endless deficits?

Can a Great Society go bust and remain great? Can it continue to deliver more education, more social services, more pensions, more job security by out-shoveling baloney dollars?

Or is all the talk about a richer and fuller life for the common man meaningless without a high degree of fiscal honesty and integrity?

Last month Senators ROMAN HRUSKA and CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, introduced a snowball-in-hell bill. It calls for a constitutional amendment that would require Congress each year to collect as much money as it appropriates, except in case of war or other dire emergency.

In addition, the Senators want half a billion dollars in collections over expenditures so that it may be applied to the national debt. At the rate of half a billion dollars a year the national debt could be paid off in some 540 years.

This bill will be lucky if it even gets a laugh. The new-think has it that the national debt may be ignored, that "controlled inflation" is necessary to provide maximum employment, and that as long as the gross national product in terms of dollars keeps rising everything is hunky-dory.

There is, fortunately, a brave minority of Congressmen who doubt this. Obviously, they are out of the "main stream," but they stubbornly wonder if the economic laws that have busted every other nation that practiced perpetual deficit financing have been repealed.

In a Senate debate last month on the deepening crisis over the American balance of payments, caused by our continued insistence on spending more abroad than we earn abroad, Senator PETER DOMINICK, of Colorado, called attention to a speech by Prof. Karl Brandt, economist of Stanford University.

Professor Brandt asserted that if we eliminate the last of the gold backing for the dollar, which has been seriously proposed, we will buy a little time, but unless we return to a balanced budget, devaluation of the dollar will be inevitable. He said:

"What is needed is a sober, deadly earnest and courageous weighing of the moral issues that are at stake when inflation moves continually and persistently.

"Inflation is one of the serious social and political diseases of the human economy. Its causes have their roots in human nature. The appetite for substantial benefits without a share in the costs is a human trait which is being exploited by politicians everywhere."

In time of war, man can hardly be blamed for borrowing against his future in an effort to save his skin. But what can we say about a nation borrowing against its future at a time when its political leaders are pointing with pride to unexampled prosperity?

The last American balanced budget occurred in the final fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration—a surplus of $1.2 billion in 1960. Since then the annual deficits have run $3.8 billion, $6.3 billion, $6.2 billion and, last year, $8.2 billion.

Each additional billion adds to the debt service, the amount of money that must be allocated to the interest on Government obligations before a penny can be spent for the operation of the Government, national defense, and additional social services and public works.

Down this line, where do we go? Where has every other country gone that took this road?

An ever-easier money supply, created by an outpouring of public funds unrelated to the ingathering of taxes, creates a boom cycle. Powerful pressure by business and labor joins the overwhelming inclination of politicians to fuel the roaring flames. The cry arises that "deflation," meaning debt reduction or even a balanced budget, would create unemployment and misery.

At the point of no return things begin to happen fast. Prices rise faster than wages. Investors flee from bonds or demand fantastic interest rates. Common stock prices go into orbit and people rush to buy tangible things like land and jewels. All who lent money in good faith are ruined.

Citizens holding Government securities or life insurance policies, and those who depend on fixed pensions and annuities find themselves holding nothing. The Government, unable to finance itself through the sale of low-interest obligations, is forced to resort to seizure and confiscation.

There goes the "Great Society," "the war on poverty," "the New Frontiers." All that's left is the last chapter of borrow, boom and bust.

No promised land will be reached by broken promises. No security is to be achieved by national dishonesty. No man's future is safe in the hands of a political philosophy that is willing to buy today's popularity with tomorrow's agony.

THE 47TH BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite attention to the 47th independence day of Byelorussia. This has just been referred to by the distinguished, Most Reverend Archbishop Vasili of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in America, with the gracious permission of our Chaplain, Dr. Harris. The archbishop has indeed made an eloquent plea for help to these people who have been held in tyranny and subjection for so many decades.

AMERICA SHOULD SUPPORT THE GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I emphasize that we should give support to the Government of the German Federal Republic which is now engaged in making a very hard decision concerning temporal relations with Israel, under threat of blackmail by the other Arab States, excluding a number of Arab States which are led by President Bourguiba of Tunisia.

What we are all seeking in this area of the world is not a continuance of hate, blackmail, and bellicosity. We are seeking peace. It is symbolic that the nation which has so much on its conscience with respect to the killing of 6 million Jews in World War II should now be seeking diplomatic ties with Israel, a country in which so many Jews sought refuge.

That is a fine thing for peace in the world. We can only hope and pray that the Arab States would also see that this is a fine thing for world peace. But if they do not, there is no reason why the U.S. Government should not let the German Federal Republic Government know that they will have our moral backing and support for the act they are performing. That support should also go to other countries who help to seek peace in the Middle East, instead of the continuance of the dangerous tinderbox situation. In the Middle East we face probably the most dangerous foreign crisis immediately after that of Vietnam.

Mr. President, I urge the President to express to the German Federal Republic the support of the United States in this very serious issue which affects our foreign policy.

FIRST MEETING OF REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, an event unique in American political history occurred Wednesday in Washington, D.C., when the Republican Coordinating Committee held its first meeting. It was unique because the organization includes five former presidential nominees of our party, 5 Governors representing the Republican Governors Association, 5 top officers of the Republican National Committee and the 11 Senate and House Republican leaders. Even more noteworthy was the ability of this group to meet and produce a statement on party policy that has already gained widespread attention in television, radio, and the press, and marks a real step forward for the Republican Party.

It is with pride and pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to include the adopted statement as a part of my remarks and to include the list of coordinating committee members who were in attendance for the meeting.

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

DECLARATION FOR THE REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 10, 1965

PURPOSE

The Republican coordinating committee was created (1) to broaden the advisory base on national party policy; (2) to set up task forces to study and make recommendations for dealing with the problems that confront the people of our Nation; and (3) to stimulate communication among the members of the party and others in developing a common approach to the Nation's problems.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Recent denials to Negro citizens of their basic constitutional right to vote have aroused the conscience of every American. In some areas these rights have been denied by

force and fraud and we are outraged that in the year 1965 these conditions should exist.

For more than 100 years the Republican Party has fought to protect the rights of every minority group and we urge all citizens to join us in this cause. We urgently favor Federal action to assure all citizens of the United States of their constitutional rights without discrimination on account of race or color.

The goal of the Republican Party is that by the 1966 elections every American citizen shall be assured of his constitutional right to vote.

FOREIGN POLICY

Republicans, in their role as the loyal opposition, have consistently advocated, and now support, the administration's announced policy in defending free South Vietnam against Communist aggression. We deplore the disruptive voices of appeasement in the Democratic Party which undercut the President in his conduct of foreign affairs, at a time of national crisis.

The President can always count on Republican support where the administration's foreign policy is firm and decisive on the side of freedom. By the same taken we owe a duty to the Nation to point up those areas where the administration's policy has failed and to offer constructive alternative proposals. Our task force on foreign policy shall have as one of its major objectives the examination of some of the most massive failures in foreign policy in recent American history—the consolidation of the Communist beachhead in Cuba, the expansion of Communist influence and control in Africa and the Near East, the deterioration of the Atlantic Alliance.

America's voice in the world, once strong and clear, now with rare exceptions is mute, indecisive, and inconsistent. It will be the Republican goal to fill this vacuum of international leadership not merely by criticising what we believe is wrong, but by proposing those policies we believe are right.

TASK FORCES

The Republican coordinating committee today established the following task force assignments and requested the Republican National chairman, Dean Burch, and his elected successor as of April 1, Ray Bliss, to appoint the members of the task forces after appropriate consultation with the members of the coordinating committee:

1. On human rights and responsibilities.
2. On the conduct of foreign relations.
3. On the functions of the Federal, State, and local governments.
4. On job opportunity.
5. On Federal fiscal and monetary policies.

Other task force assignments are still in the discussion stage and will be announced.

The committee enthusiastically endorses the statement delivered by President Eisenhower as a guideline for future action. He has suggested basic problems and goals on which Republicans are agreed.

Members present:

LESLIE C. ARENDS, House minority whip.

Ray C. Bliss, vice chairman, Republican National Committee.

CLARENCE J. BROWN, House ranking member of Rules Committee.

Dean Burch, chairman, Republican National Committee.

Thomas E. Dewey, former presidential nominee (1944–48).

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Senate minority leader.

GERALD R. FORD, House minority leader.

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, chairman, Senate Republican policy committee.

Mrs. Patricia Hutar, assistant chairman, Republican National Committee (substituting for vacant vice chairmanship of the Republican National Committee).

THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Senate minority whip.

MELVIN R. LAIRD, chairman, House Republican conference.

John A. Love, Governor of Colorado.

Mrs. Collis P. Moore, vice chairman, Republican National Committee.

THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman, Republican senatorial campaign committee.

Richard M. Nixon, former presidential nominee (1960).

JOHN J. RHODES, chairman, House Republican policy committee.

Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York.

George W. Romney, Governor of Michigan.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, chairman, Senate Republican conference.

William W. Scranton, Governor of Pennsylvania.

BOB WILSON, chairman, Republican congressional campaign committee.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, from his winter home in Palm Desert, Calif., telephoned his fellow members of the coordinating committee the following message which was received with warm applause from those present:

Good morning to you, my friends on the newly created Republican coordinating committee. I regret that I cannot be with you but I am complimented by the invitation from your chairman to greet you briefly by telephone.

I congratulate the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership and Dean Burch for initiating this effort to widen participation in the formulation of party policy and programs. We all understand that the party's current record is made by our Members of Congress and by Republican officials at other echelons, but I think it is a healthy and progressive step to bring into the consultative process those who have been honored with the party's presidential nomination, those who represent the Republican Governors Association, and those who serve as the principal officers of the Republican National Committee. Possibly you may later decide to add a few others.

In such a body will be reflected the courage, the dedication, the self-reliance and the initiative of the millions of loyal citizens who make up the United States of America.

Second, I applaud the proposal to set up task forces on great public questions so that our party can benefit from the advice and recommendations of those who are especially knowledgeable in the complex field in which modern government must participate.

Life today commands our attention on many fronts. So the Republican coordinating committee, if it is to do its job, must address itself to those problems which are the proper concern of government.

Foremost among these are the fields of foreign operation and national defense. Here our Government is in fact dealing with the world's safety. It is an awesome task and one in which a minimum of partisanship should be injected.

Of course, we, as Republicans—and in a minority position in government—have no direct part in policymaking in international relations. But that does not excuse us from responsibility for representing sound views in the matter, nor should it.

I know the coordinating committee intends, as one of its first moves, to establish a task force on foreign policy. For the time is certainly ripe for a maximum of constructive thought on the difficulties we encounter in the world. I hope that the finest minds available can participate in this effort.

The entire complex of American objectives, of strategy, and the continued enlistment of free nations in the cause of peace needs reexamination. In this area we have a real opportunity to make a constructive, stimulating, and influential contribution to public knowledge and thinking.

On the domestic scene, we are witnessing a great increase in Federal assumption of the functions of State and local governments. Apparently there is a belief in Washington that every problem affecting our society requires Federal funds and Federal supervision to attack it effectively.

Local problems of every description—training police, kindergarten attendance, sewage disposal, junked automobiles, zoning, and even payment of apartment rents, to name a mere fraction of such problems—are to come under the watchful Federal eye. Each item of course will require Federal funds and additional Federal bureaucrats. Just why a bureau in Washington will know better how to solve a local problem than those who live with it is not explained. Indeed, just what is going to happen to our traditional Federal, State, and local relationship is not even discussed.

But the Democratic Party has apparently adopted the doctrine that the role of the Federal Government—and its costs—are unlimited and without boundaries. If such theories are to prevail, then the entire concept of a limited Federal establishment—acting only where the State and local government cannot—is about to vanish. With such a result will go the freedom, the initiative, and ingenuity of the American people, the very qualities that our Constitution seeks to preserve and strengthen.

As one who believes that the citizen's commonsense, personal responsibility, and freedom of action are the backbone of our national greatness, I think the whole question needs the most penetrating review. To do this another task force is unquestionably needed.

Another matter of the utmost importance is that of avoiding deterioration in the value of our currency and of maintaining respect for the dollar abroad. Here again a task force of competence can do much to help us fight inflation, clarify our thinking, and help the Nation.

Clearly, we have much to explore, much to do, and every reason, as a great political party, to undertake these tasks promptly and energetically. We must make an effective beginning now. I have every confidence we will do so. I share your conviction that our party must have an ever-increasing influence on the future of our country. The importance of our role will be measured by the intensity of our dedication and effort. Today we begin anew with full adherence to our principles and with complete devotion to the greatest society ever established—the America of our Founding Fathers.

NINETY-NINE PERCENT OF AMERICANS WANT THEIR CHILDREN TO GO TO COLLEGE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with hearings beginning tomorrow on the higher education bill, I would like to call attention to a very timely article appearing in this morning's Washington Post. While we all know that going to college is very important to Americans and that it is becoming more important every year, the Harris Survey has attempted to measure this importance in statistical terms. They report that 99 percent of all parents with children 18 years old or younger want to see them go to college. Moreover, 82 percent say it is "extremely important" for their children to get there.

These are facts to remember as we open hearings on a bill to provide university extension, continuing education, college library assistance, library training and research, student assistance, and support for developing institutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the March 15, 1965, Washington Post entitled "College Training Held Vital Today," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COLLEGE TRAINING HELD VITAL TODAY

(By Louis Harris)

If the dreams of most American families are realized, the current explosion in college enrollments is only a bubble compared to what is coming in the future. Today, 99 percent of all parents with children 18 years old or younger want to see them go to college. What is more, 82 percent say it is "extremely important" for their children to get there.

The impact such dreams may have on higher educational institutions becomes clear in one statistic. In 1963, when American colleges were crowded with almost 4.5 million students, only 40.4 percent of all youngsters of college age were enrolled in school.

An in-depth survey of a cross section of parents of precollege children reveals that college is now looked on in the same way people once viewed a high school education. A basic part of the new American creed is that a young person will not be able to find a good job without a college degree.

Typical of the views people now express about college was the sweeping statement of the wife of a lawyer in Bloomington, Ind.: "A college education has now become the very foundation for life."

But three out of four people are even more specific about the economic benefits of going to college. A mother in Jim Thorpe, Pa., said: "My kids will have a feeling of job security all their lives from that diploma. No diploma and no security; it's as simple as that." A civil servant in Sudbury, Mass., added, "There just won't be any kind of decent job in 10 years without that college degree. There's no sense denying it."

Such answers emerged in overwhelming volume when parents were asked why they feel that a college education is important for their children:

Why college is important

	Total parents (percent)
To get a job, 74 percent:	
Can't get any kind of job without it	69
Machines replacing unskilled labor	5
Noneconomic benefits, 23 percent:	
Way to get ahead socially	7
Makes for better society	5
College now same as high school used to be	4
To develop full potential	3
Broadening, improves thinking	3
I suffered for not going	1
College not important, 2 percent:	
College not for everyone	1
Not so much for girls	1
Not sure, 1 percent.	

The career motivation is fortified by the growing realization that machines are eliminating jobs once filled by unskilled labor. A 38-year-old flood control maintenance man in Brea, Calif., put it this way: "There's getting to be too many people and too many machines in this world and not enough jobs. Only good jobs will be left. College will get them for you."

Accompanying the job advantages are powerful overtones that going to college can be a vehicle for improving one's social standing. Parents who are college graduates particularly point out these social benefits. But only a minority of people talk about the ways in which a college education can stimulate and develop a young person's intellect.

Parents, of course, are the older generation, and most of them feel that they have learned the value of an education the hard way. Fully 75 percent say they wish they had gone further in their own education. Easily the top loss people feel they have suffered from not having a better education is economic and parents are bound and determined not to see their children make the same mistakes.

High on the list of major mistakes is not having gone further in school to prepare for a better job:

What missed most in education

	Total parents (percent)
Chance to prepare for good job, 83 percent:	
Never got trained for good job	54
Wanted to be professional	13
Wanted to learn skill	9
Wanted to be a teacher	5
Wanted to be a nurse	2
Nonjob benefits, 17 percent:	
Can't understand what people talk about	6
Could have helped my children more	4
More basic knowledge and culture	3
How to express myself	2
Learn self-confidence	2

UNITED BUSINESS SCHOOLS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during the hearings on the cold war GI bill, Mr. Harry E. Ryan, president of the New Kensington Commercial School, and a member of the board of directors of the United Business Schools Association, testified before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs.

The cold war GIs are the most educationally discriminated against of all the veterans of our generation. The greatest educational need facing all Congress is for a cold war GI bill.

It is important to remember that of the veterans who utilized the World War II GI bill, only 29 percent used it for college training, and only 51 percent of those who used the Korean GI bill. This statistic reveals the importance of vocational, high school, and training other than college for our veteran population.

The United Business Schools Association represents almost 500 independent business schools and colleges in this country who have played an important and major part in the complex educational programs of our Nation. It is through the contributions of these schools that countless thousands have been better educated and have become productive citizens.

Because of the emphasis which Mr. Ryan's testimony places on this part of our educational needs, I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY HARRY E. RYAN, PRESIDENT, NEW KENSINGTON COMMERCIAL SCHOOL, NEW KENSINGTON, PA., TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, U.S. SENATE, CONCURRING S. 9, COLD WAR GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Harry E. Ryan. I am president of New Kensington Commercial School of New Kensington, Pa., which is accredited as a 2-year school of business by the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools.

By way of background, I also serve as a member of the board of directors of United Business Schools Association which is the one educational association in which nearly 500 of the quality independent business schools and colleges of the Nation hold membership. The roots of UBSA go back more than 50 years to 1912. However, many member institutions have been in existence for more than 100 years.

For nearly 20 years I have been associated with business education including the training of veterans under programs subsequent to World War II and the Korean war. I hold memberships in the Pennsylvania Society of Public Accountants and the National Association of Accountants. I have also served two terms as President of the Pennsylvania Association of Private Business Schools.

It is a privilege to appear before you today and express our support for the continuation of a program of veterans education along the lines of the successful Korean GI bill. The position of the United Business Schools Association is the result of association committee analysis, consideration by our board of directors and discussion at past conventions. This, of course, refers not only to S. 9 but also to S. 5 of the 88th Congress; S. 349 of the 87th Congress and similar measures introduced in the 86th Congress.

IMPORTANT GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the development of the position of the United Business Schools Association on S. 9, we believe that the following general considerations are entitled to great weight as they are considered by your committee:

1. Conditions today are such that thousands of young men are required by the compulsory draft law to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces for a specific period of time. If there should be any question in the mind as to safety and lack of risk in the military service today, we need only to mention Vietnam, Berlin, Congo, Formosa, Korea, Greenland, and numerous satellite areas and other hot spots in the world. These serve as reminders that we must maintain a constant state of preparedness and must continue to expose our servicemen to the hazards of potentially explosive military incidents. Following this active duty, these young people are further compelled to perform additional services in the Active Reserve and later, the Standby Reserve. Their total obligation, once entered upon active duty, generally extends for 6 years.

If these cold war conditions were not present, the majority of these men would not be entering military service but would be pursuing their own individual goals in civilian life. At the present time our Federal Government does not offer these young people any help in coping with the problems created for them by the cold war and their compulsory military service. They need the help of this legislation to catch up with those contemporaries who were not asked to serve in the Armed Forces.

2. Educational assistance to these young people is only fair based upon the student deferment policy. Many students were deferred due to the Government's recognition of the importance of education and it is inconsistent to deny educational benefits to those who have already served. If education is considered important enough to warrant deferment, by the same token, it is of comparable importance to justify postservice educational assistance.

It is also true that the student deferment policy placed college education in a highly preferred status. Persons who wish to pursue trade or other postsecondary education are not generally eligible for student deferment under selective service regulations. Students attending our private business schools or colleges are not eligible for deferment, as a general rule, under these regulations. Our goals as a nation require that our young people obtain as much advance training as possible, college or otherwise, and therefore educational assistance is desirable.

3. The relatively low educational attainment of veterans affected by this bill shows clearly the need for this legislation. A Veterans' Administration survey dated May 29, 1959, states:

"At the time of their separation from the Armed Forces, 6 percent had not completed elementary school; 10 percent had completed elementary school but had had no further schooling; 29 percent had had some high school education but had not graduated; 35 percent had graduated from high school but had had no college training; 8 percent had completed 1, 2, or 3 years of college work; and 12 percent had completed 4 or more years of college."

The final report of the Bradley commission concluded that the interruption of education of post-Korean veterans would be their main handicap. They stated:

"The commission recognized that the main handicap which may be incurred by the peacetime ex-serviceman, other than service-connected disabilities elsewhere discussed is the effect that a period of 2 year's mandatory service at an early age may have upon education. At the age of entrance into military service, schooling is the occupation of many, and military service will delay some young men from advancing their formal education and will perhaps cause some to drop their plans forever because marriage and other pursuits may interfere with their return to school or college."

4. An educational assistance bill will provide America with professional, technical and vocational skills that otherwise might be irreplacably lost. Our present critical shortages in certain essential occupations would be even more catastrophic except for the passage of the previous GI bills.

5. We have already recognized GI bills in the past; namely, in the World War II GI bill and the Korean GI bill, and the need to furnish our servicemen with opportunities to overcome in part the years lost from civilian life and to establish themselves in productive and useful occupations. In a press release issued on June 22, 1954, the 10th anniversary of the World War II bill, the Veterans' Administration stated:

"Through the GI bill, the World War II veterans have become the best educated group of people in the history of the United States.

"Because of their training they have raised their income level to the point where they now are paying an extra billion dollars a year in income taxes to Uncle Sam. At this rate, GI bill trained veterans alone will pay off the entire $15 billion cost of the GI education and training program within the next 15 years."

This means that the educational assistance given to the young servicemen will be self-liquidating. The Federal Government will be paid back the cost of the education through increased taxes on higher earnings resulting from the students' education. Therefore, ultimately the investment the Government makes in educational assistance will be completely repaid.

6. Actual hostilities in Korea ceased on July 27, 1953. The Korean conflict, for the purposes of educational assistance, was officially terminated by Presidential declaration of January 31, 1955. This arbitrary date cut off many men who are entitled to these educational benefits equally with those who were in service prior to January 31, 1955. It would not be fair to exclude these men from educational benefits as a result of this arbitrary cutoff date.

This is only a brief summary of some of the major considerations which we feel are important to your committee. There are undoubtedly many other considerations which we have overlooked but it is apparent that there is a need for this legislation now.

WICHITA, KANS., NEWSPAPER ENDORSES GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, few things please a Texan more than to have the natural beauty of his State praised by residents of other areas. An area of beauty in Texas that is currently drawing much praise and recognition is the Guadalupe Mountain Range in far western Texas. This unique area has been recommended for national park status by the Department of the Interior and President Johnson, and the merit of this proposal is becoming widely recognized.

As author of the pending bill, S. 295, that would create this national park, I am very pleased to see a fine description and endorsement of the plan appearing in the press of Wichita, Kans., where it is suggested that many Kansans will enjoy a visit to this magnificent area when the park is established. I ask unanimous consent that the article titled "Park Would Add to Enjoyment of Visitors to Carlsbad Area," by Bob Tonsing, Sr., travel editor of the Wichita, Kans., Eagle and Beacon Sunday magazine, published February 21, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle and Beacon, Feb. 21, 1965]

PARK WOULD ADD TO ENJOYMENT OF VISITORS TO CARLSBAD AREA

(By Bob Tonsing, Sr.)

Carlsbad Caverns National Park, usually rated as New Mexico's greatest tourist attraction, for many years has been a magnet for Kansas honeymooners, Boy Scout troops, chamber of commerce good will groups, and the numerous clan-labeled tourists. Less than 700 miles from Wichita by good highways, it can be visited on a hurried weekend auto trip.

Most persons, however, prefer a more leisurely experience, with time to wander off the main routes into scenic localities. Many families now use camping vehicles, haul trailers, or carry tents and sleeping bags. These find that a major drawback of the Carlsbad region is lack of suitable facilities in the desert terrain.

A solution seems near. About 25 miles from the caverns' entrance, as a plane flies—some 55 by road—is an area that seems desolate, yet possesses a beauty and tranquillity that satisfies the needs of nerve-jarred city dwellers. The southern extremity of the Guadalupe Range juts from New Mexico into Texas. It comes to an abrupt end in El Capitan, an 8,200-feet-high, sheer-faced mountain that has served as a landmark for travelers since the days of Coronado. It towers above Kansas traveling on U.S. 62–180 to El Paso.

Just north of El Capitan is Guadalupe Peak, rising to 8,751 feet above sea level—the highest point in Texas.

This part of the seemingly barren range has a pine-covered, rolling highland slashed by deep canyons. One of the most beautiful is McKittrick Canyon, with an area of some 6,000 acres. It is part of a region totaling 71,790 acres which may be the Nation's next national park.

Nearly all of it now belongs to J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene, Tex., a businessman with a lifelong interest in conservation. He operates the Guadalupe Mountain Ranch on land which his father acquired. The son has added considerably to the original holdings.

Recently this writer and some 30 others from over the Nation visited Hunter's mountain home on a State-sponsored tour of west Texas. He told the group that he has had several tempting offers from developers wanting to subdivide the area for commercial purposes, but has rejected them. He believes that regions of outstanding natural beauty should be saved in their primitive state for enjoyment of the American people. It belongs to them, Hunter said, even though he holds title to the land.

"How can anyone consider himself owner of this magnificent land, when these mountains have been here for several million years, and I'll be lucky to be here for 70?"

To carry out this purpose, Representative JOE POOL, of Texas, is introducing a bill this session which would establish the Guadalupe National Park. He submitted such a proposal last session, but it did not reach the floor for action. Before offering the measure, Representative POOL asked for an investigation of the region by the Interior Department to assess its possibilities as a national park.

After the study's completion, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall urged Congress to pass the bill with these comments:

"The area set aside for the park contains a combination of scenic and scientific attributes that qualify it as an outstanding addition to the national park system. It contains the most diversified and beautiful scenery in Texas, some of the most beautiful landscape in the entire southwestern part of the United States, and its Permian marine limestone mountains contain the most extensive and significant fossil reefs in the world."

His final phrase refers to the Guadalupe Mountains exposure of the famous Capitan barrier reef, formed in the millions of years when central North America was a shallow sea. The same geological period resulted in the vast Carlsbad Caverns.

The travel writers' jaunts along foot trails of McKittrick Canyon and an all-day horseback ride up narrow paths to a lush basin atop the range confirmed Udall's description of the area. The visitors found trees varying from scrub juniper to towering Douglas-fir, ponderosa and limber pine aspen and maple.

Texas' only trout stream ripples 4 miles down the canyon, then disappears underground. The State's lone herd of wild elk—now numbering more than 200 head—and a flock of wild turkeys are a part of the ranch's carefully protected and highly varied animal life.

McKittricks' temperatures in summer range well below those of the nearby desert, and its situation on the southeast slope pro-

tects from winter winds. Snowfall is infrequent.

Not much is known of the region's history, but some studies indicate human occupancy at least 6,000 years ago. Mescalero Apaches lived in the area when white men first arrived, and Spanish conquistadores referred to it in their writings. The Indians were little disturbed until 1849, when the U.S. Army sent in an exploring party. White men and Indians both used El Capitan as a signal peak.

The famed Butterfield Overland Stage route, reaching the area in 1858, crossed the range at McKittrick Canyon.

Wallace E. Pratt in 1959 gave 6,000 acres of McKittrick Canyon to the National Park Service and suggested that it obtain title to the rest if the public ever was to benefit from its scenic and educational values. He suggested a mountain highway—similar to Skyline Drive in Shenandoah National Park—that he said "could be built along the crest of the Guadalupes, starting at the present terminus of the mountain highway at Carlsbad Caverns, continuing to the southwest to the ridges above McKittrick on Guadalupe Peak, then descending 4,000 feet to El Paso Gap."

Whether or not this dream can come true, Federal and State agencies are cooperating in a study of scenic highway development to provide access to outdoor recreational resources.

Only congressional approval of Representative POOL'S bill is necessary to start road work that will open Guadalupe's unseen wonders to the Nation's travelers and supplement the drawing power of neighboring Carlsbad Caverns. It has been estimated that a new national park in the Guadalupe area has a potential of 900,000 visitors a year. And Kansas is counted on to supply a strong percentage of that number.

CONGRESSMAN HENRY B. GONZALEZ CALLS FOR TIGHTER CONTROL ON FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, no matter is of more vital concern to the economy of my State than the oil import control program. No matter is more important than revising the present oil import control program to allow domestic oil producers a reasonable share in the growth of the domestic market. The present program is not working; our domestic industry is still declining. In a recent 4-year period, over 25,000 Texans lost their jobs in the oil industry, because Texas producers are not allowed a fairer share of the domestic market.

It does not make sense, in a period when we are desperately worried about our balance-of-payments problem, to continue to be such a large importer of unneeded foreign oil. If an administrative remedy is not forthcoming, Congress must take action to further protect our national security and domestic economy by reducing the foreign oil flood.

In hearings before Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall last week, many persons outlined this need with great vigor, but none more persuasively than the very able Congressman from the 20th Congressional District of Texas, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, of San Antonio. Congressman GONZALEZ can always be found standing up for the public interest and the needs of his constituents, and his testimony in favor of more positive oil import controls is convincing indeed. I ask unanimous consent that the complete statement presented by Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ at the Department of the Interior oil import hearings on March 11, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS SHOULD BE FROZEN

(By HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Member of Congress)

Mr. Chairman, first I want to express my gratitude for being given the opportunity to testify today.

Second, in view of the crowded schedule and the many distinguished persons who are due to testify at this hearing, I would like to come right to the point. As an American and an elected official from the State of Texas, I feel I would be negligent if I did not voice my views on foreign oil imports and their effects on the domestic industry, particularly in my home State.

In 1950, oil imports constituted 13 percent of total U.S. consumption. Today, imports supply more than 20 percent of consumption. Further, and even more indicative of the stagnant domestic industry, the expansion in domestic demand is being taken up each year one-third by increased imports, one-third by activity in the southern Louisiana offshore and onshore area, and the remaining one-third is being shared inequitably by the same companies that do the importing and the rest of the industry. A stagnant industry is an unhealthy industry. The symptoms are reduced activity, reduced profits, reduced jobs. These are the symptoms easily seen in the national and the Texas petroleum industry.

It is not enough to say that "It is only natural that oil should figure strongly in any consideration of national security." That is understating the case. Seventy-five percent of the total energy consumed by the United States is produced by oil and gas. We are not simply an incidental user of oil and gas. We are an habitual user, an addict, if you will. Cut us off from our normal supply and we would go into national withdrawal symptoms that would quickly produce a national crisis.

Yet, through the mandatory oil import control program we are following a policy that will lead us one day to be totally dependent on foreign imports for our oil needs. For the vicious cycle of increased imports, reduced domestic activity, increased imports, has already set in. This cycle, if we continue to encourage it through the import quota system, will eventually lead to the complete decay of the domestic petroleum industry and to our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

For this Nation to become dependent on foreign oil imports for its energy needs would be as safe and sane a policy as for us to depend on any army mercenaries for our defense needs. Oil does not merely figure strongly in any consideration of national security. It figures preeminently.

I have spoken with a number of persons representing all elements of the petroleum industry, as well as persons outside of the industry but deeply concerned with it. Most of then will admit, privately at least, that the present program of mandatory import quotas should not continue. In fact, I do not believe any person familiar with the operation of the program can fail to see its shortcomings. The reason is simple. No program based on an unsound and unfair premise can succeed or continue to operate without becoming disruptive in an area as important and vital as the petroleum industry. The present program is both unsound and unfair. Its effect has been to enrich a few at the expense of the many in the oil and gas industry. Even such a harsh result might be tolerable if done for reasons of efficiency, economy, progress, and the national welfare. But none of these ends are being served by the mandatory import quotas and the arbitrary manner by which these quotas are allocated.

The cold and hard facts are that under the mandatory import quota program oil and gas producing activity in the United States has steadily declined and conditions have deteriorated for the domestic industry as a whole. One cannot examine the statistical evidence of this without becoming alarmed. According to figures that appeared in the December 1964 issue of the Independent Petroleum Monthly, using 1957–59 as the base period, and summarizing the trends for the year 1963, a decrease in activity is noted in every key area:

	Percent
Geophysical activity was down	32.9
Active rotary rigs were down	29.7
Exploratory wells were down	17.8
Total wells were down	16.5
Crude oil found was down	25.0
Total oil found was down	11.9
Employment was down	12.1
Crude oil price was down	3.7

It is no wonder then, that in a speech given to the American Petroleum Institute on November 11, 1964, Assistant Secretary of the Interior John M. Kelly said: "It is clear to me that the rate of exploratory activity must be increased unless this Nation is to run grave risks from the standpoint of the security of its petroleum supplies."

It serves no useful or constructive purpose to gloss over the truth about the oil import program, to minimize its weaknesses or to exaggerate its strong points. It would be shortsighted, for example, to ignore the part played by the oil trade in our foreign relations. But it is myopic to stress this role of oil imports beyond its actual significance, or to dismiss the danger of becoming dependent on foreign oil on the grounds that most of it originates in this hemisphere.

The Department of the Interior's recent appraisal of the petroleum industry in the United States places some emphasis on the fact that 97 percent of U.S. oil imports originate in the Western Hemisphere. I find this sort of explanation or palliation to the fact that imports have soared from 1.8 million barrels per day in 1959 when the mandatory program went into effect to 2.3 million barrels per day in 1964, totally unsatisfactory.

It is true that of the 2.3 million barrels per day imported in 1963, 1.32 million barrels per day came from Venezuela and 175,000 barrels per day came from other South American sources, and that only 300,000 barrels per day came from the Middle East. But first let us reverse these figures momentarily. I think it is safe to say that if these figures and percentages were reversed, and 97 percent of our oil imports were coming from the Middle East, there would be immediate cause for alarm, a clear and present danger, you might say, that in light of recent history a significant portion of our oil supply could be cut off quickly, without notice, and indefinitely. This, of course, is what happened to Europe during the 1956 Suez crisis

In other words, our present sense of security in connection with our foreign imports stems in large measure from the fact that most of these imports are coming from Venezuela and other South American countries. This is a false sense of security.

Now, no one in Congress is more concerned and interested in the stability of the countries in South America, their progress and prosperity, and our relations with them, than I am. I have been a consistent supporter of the Alliance for Progress and of the goal of better United States-Latin American relations. But helping a nation stabilize its one-crop economy, or an economy almost totally dependent on the export of one commodity, by importing its product is one thing. Making ourselves dependent on the

import of this product is another. To view Venezuela or any South American country as our private gas pump on the Caribbean is wrong and ignores political reality.

I do not advocate cutting off or even cutting back our oil imports from Venezuela. I do propose to look at the facts as the facts, however. The United States cannot afford to allow the trend of higher and higher imports to continue.

My point is that for us to rely on foreign oil imports is dangerous to our national security, and that danger exists whether the country of origin is in the Eastern Hemisphere or the Western Hemisphere.

OIL IMPORTS AND THEIR IMPACT ON TEXAS

Texas, of course, is the leading oil-producing State. The stereotyped Texas oil tycoon, wildcatting his way to fame and fortune, is practically a folk hero in our culture. It may be comforting and pleasant to think of the Texas oilman as some sort of combination Clark Gable-Spencer Tracy and to impute his virility to the Texas oil industry. The truth is that if the national domestic industry is wobbly and staggering, and it is, then the Texas industry is already bedridden.

Since the mandatory program began, Texas oil producers have been unable to share equitably in the domestic demand increase. This has cost them 449 million barrels in crude production and a monetary loss of $1.3 billion. This combined with the decline in Texas crude prices has caused a loss in State tax revenues of $112.9 million.

Texas independents are producing less crude oil today than in 1959. At the same time the 13 integrated companies operating in the State have increased their share of the State's crude output both in terms of percentage of production and absolute numbers. They have gone from 48.8 percent of the State's production in 1959 to 54.3 percent in 1964. From 474.2 millions of barrels to 538.4 millions of barrels. In the same period the rest of the Texas industry has gone from 497.8 million barrels to 453.5 million.

This is a sad picture, one that should concern everyone and particularly those in Federal Government, and one that cannot be whitewashed. The Texas picture reflects the national picture. Everyone knows that the independent oil producers historically have been the backbone of the oil and gas industry. They have done the exploratory work and they have found and developed most of American oil.

The decline of the Texas industry is demonstrated by the following figures comparing 1959 and 1963:

Texas well completions have dropped from 19,386 to 16,298.

Texas wildcats have dropped from 4,101 to 3,623.

Texas oil completions have dropped from 11,411 to 8,586.

Texas active rotary rigs have dropped from 784 to 474.

Texas oil reserves have declined by approximately 300 million barrels.

Texas employment in the oil and gas industry has dropped by 25,900.

Twenty-five thousand nine hundred Texans formerly working in the petroleum industry have had to go elsewhere for employment. Earlier I quoted figures showing a decline nationwide of employment in the petroleum industry of 12.1 percent.

In my first year as a U.S. Congressman, I joined the fight to end the bracero program. The similarities between the mandatory oil import quota program and the bracero program are, to me, striking. The bracero program, which Congress finally eliminated last year, was both unfair and harmful to our economy. Specifically, we were importing foreign manpower through a semifeudal system. The effect was not only to depress the wage market in the United States but also to deprive American citizens of jobs. The program was being supported and perpetuated by a relative handful of powerful importers who were causing 10,000 Americans to remain unemployed.

The foreign oil import program is as unjustified, unwarranted, unhealthy, and unhappy as was the foreign worker import program, with the additional factor of the danger to national security that the present program represents.

H.R. 2977: THE DEMOCRATIC INDUSTRIES ACT OF 1965

I introduced H.R. 2977 on January 18, 1965 for the purpose of offering an alternative program to the present mandatory oil import quotas. Briefly, the bill calls for a freeze of the present overall import level until domestic production has been able to share in some of the domestic market growth and for a bidding system to allocate future imports.

I am particularly gratified that several distinguished persons who have already testified at this hearing have endorsed a freeze-bidding plan to replace the present program. It is also pleasing to know that the Texas Legislature has also endorsed such a plan. Copies of the Texas resolutions endorsing this plan were introduced in the record of these proceedings by Gov. John Connally yesterday. I intend to make a series of speeches to the House of Representatives on this subject in the near future and to continue to urge my colleagues to consider my proposals contained in H.R. 2977.

Actually, the changes I am calling for can be brought about with an Executive order and without legislation. The Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1958 contains ample authority for the adoption by Executive order of my proposed program. In fact, the legislative history of this clause shows that Congress intended to empower President Eisenhower to use a quota-bidding procedure. So there is nothing new about quota bidding except that it has not been invoked. By the way, revenues that would go into the Department of the Treasury as the proceeds from the bidding would approximate $400 million each year, conservatively estimated.

The freezing of overall import levels would represent a radical departure from previous practices in the sense that the steady growth of oil imports would be halted for the first time in many years. But this is a departure that would be warranted by the present dangerous situation and the growing tendency to become more and more dependent on foreign oil.

The Department of the Interior should by its very nature be the champion of the full and proper use and development of our natural resources including gas and oil. It is my hope that the Department will take immediate action to halt the further deterioration of the domestic industry, without which our oil and gas resources cannot be fully developed, and without which our national security is endangered.

Thank you very much.

INTERNATIONAL DeMOLAY WEEK

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the week of March 14 through 21, 1965, has been designated as International DeMolay Week. During this period of time, members of the Order of DeMolay will engage in activities designed to bring the story of DeMolay and its aims and achievements before the public.

I take this occasion to congratulate the Order of DeMolay and especially the DeMolays of Arkansas upon their many worthwhile activities. This organization helps young men to become better citizens, while at the same time engaging in projects which are useful to their community and State.

We in Arkansas are proud of the fact that Arkansas placed first last year in the International DeMolay Week contest.

Gov. Orval E. Faubus has proclaimed the week of March 14–21, 1965, as Arkansas DeMolay Week, and I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's proclamation be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

To all to whom these presents shall come, greetings:

Whereas the Arkansas State Council, Order of DeMolay is observing the 46th anniversary of the international youth movement, the Order of DeMolay, on March 18, 1965; and

Whereas DeMolay is a character-building organization dedicated to the purposes of helping young men 14 to 21 years of age to become better sons, better citizens, and better leaders; and

Whereas the youth group is well known for its charitable projects, community services and healthy social activities and for providing our young men with the desire for realizing greater goals and achievements; and

Whereas recognition should be given to the many contributions made by DeMolay toward this guiding influence in the molding of today's young men for a better world of peace and brotherhood tomorrow: Now, therefore,

I, Orval E. Faubus, Governor of the State of Arkansas, do hereby proclaim the week of March 14-21, 1965, as Arkansas DeMolay Week in honor of DeMolay's meritorious service toward the communities, State, and Nation and by the authority vested in me, do urge all citizens of Arkansas to pay tribute.

_____, *Governor.*

THE NAMESAKE OF THE ORDER

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it was 651 years ago on March 18 that Jacques DeMolay, the last grand master of the medieval Knights Templar, died as a martyr to truth and fidelity, but today the ideals for which he gave his life are being perpetuated by young men the world over who are members of the Order of DeMolay.

Nearly 9 million youths that have been inducted into the order since its founding have added new luster and meaning to DeMolay's name by dedicating themselves, as he did, to the virtues of reverence, loyalty, and chivalry.

Jacques DeMolay has provided a historic heritage for the youth organization. In the 14th century as the Knights Templar grew in might, prestige, and wealth, and the popularity of the crusades declined, the order incurred the jealousy and enmity of Phillip the Fair, King of France.

Phillip ordered the arrest of DeMolay and the other Templars and had their properties and riches confiscated. Failing through torture to get DeMolay to reveal the identity of other leaders and the location of supposedly hidden treasures, Phillip had him burned at the stake

in Paris when DeMolay refused to denounce the order.

Proving that fate sometimes has a hand in many things, some 605 years later, on the anniversary of the death of DeMolay, nine Kansas City, Mo., boys met in the office of Frank S. Land, urging him on in his idea of forming a new youth group. The young boys liked the idea of organizing a club that would give them the inspiration and guidance that no other organization offered.

As they discussed their desires and needs, it was mentioned that a name must be selected. Whereupon, the boys asked Mr. Land to recite some names that would be in keeping with their ideals.

When Mr. Land mentioned DeMolay and who he was, the name was like magic to the boys. They like the sound of it and what it stood for, and they immediately clamored for its adoption. Mr. Land, being prudent and thoughtful, suggested that they think it over for a few days along with all the other names mentioned.

A few days later, the enthusiasm for the name DeMolay was still apparent in each boy, and thus it was that the new youth group was named the Order of DeMolay.

Little did this beginning nucleus know that their organization would soon spread like wildlife throughout the world. It now numbers nearly 3 million active and senior DeMolays and more than 2,500 chapters operate in the United States, its territories, and foreign countries.

This week, the Order of DeMolay is observing its 46th birthday, and we can be thankful that such a fine youth organization is teaching the young men of our country to adopt traits of character in their formative years of manhood that will remain with them and sustain them in the paths of right for the rest of their lives.

Many of the organization's senior DeMolays are found high in the ranks of leadership, serving as fellow Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet members, Governors, generals, and business leaders in general.

The age bracket for belonging to the Order of DeMolay is 14 to 21 years, with those passing 21 becoming senior DeMolays. The order is open to any boy who meets the conditions of being a normal, upright young citizen.

Activities of the Order of DeMolay range in scope from athletic endeavors to conducting traffic safety campaigns, church services, and performing charitable and community service projects.

At the altar of DeMolay, members promise among other things to be better sons, better men, better citizens.

It is with humble and modest pride that DeMolay members can point to the thousands of leaders today in all walks of life who started up the ladder of success in a DeMolay chapter room.

We, the Government leaders of the United States, can also point with pride to this record of achievement by the Order of DeMolay, and we say "Happy birthday, DeMolay"—may you continue to mold the character of our young men to an even greater degree in the future than you have in the past.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND CONGRATULATING SENATOR PELL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the future of the railroads in the economy of our great east coast is of paramount concern to this thickly populated area where so much of our industry, finance, and Government is concentrated.

This has been most evident in the hearings that our Commerce Committee has been holding on New England problems of transportation—hearings of which I have been privileged to be chairman.

The railroad problems are both immediate and long range. There is little purpose in salvaging the present without a blueprint of restoring the railroad to a level of competitive transportation service. It must match rival transit systems in speed, comfort, and cost.

Attention has been focused on the Boston to Washington corridor by the ideas and urging of my colleague, Senator PELL.

The vision of Senator PELL has been reinforced by diligent research and supported by detailed suggestions. They have been important enough to enlist the interest of the White House.

That the interest is not superficial is indicated by the allocation of Federal funds to make the deeper study that Senator PELL's idea warrants.

You may be certain that our State government in Rhode Island is appreciative of this national consideration achieved by Senator PELL. Indeed, the Rhode Island General Assembly has passed formal resolutions of congratulation to my colleague.

I am proud to add my own plaudits to Senator PELL and to ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

Resolution extending congratulations to Senator PELL for his championship of high-speed rail service in the Boston to Washington corridor, and to President Johnson for including in his budget funds to research the project

Whereas Senator CLAIBORNE PELL has long been interested in the problem of surface transportation; and

Whereas this interest has been intensely focused on high-speed rail service in the Boston to Washington corridor; and

Whereas President Johnson has recognized the need to encourage long-overdue improvement in surface transportation, and particularly in the northeast corridor of the Nation, by including in his budget $20 million to fund research and demonstrations of high-speed rail service, in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations extends hearty congratulations to Senator PELL for his championship of high-speed rail service in the Boston to Washington corridor; and to President Johnson for including in his budget necessary funds to research the project; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to Senator PELL and President Johnson.

Attest:

AUGUST P. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

OKLAHOMA SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a serious situation has developed in the Wheat Belt of this country. The Great Plains area has for many decades been the breadbasket of the Nation, producing more wheat and milling more flour than any other area.

As a result of recent wheat rate reductions made by the railroads, without a corresponding reduction in flour rates, many of the flour mills located in the Great Plains area are faced with elimination or relocation, which would disrupt the economy of the areas affected.

The Oklahoma State Legislature has taken cognizance of this problem and on February 24 adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 23. The resolution suggests a possible solution to the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES IN REGARD TO LEGISLATION PERTAINING TO NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

Whereas a strong, efficient transportation system is essential to the well-being and defense of our Nation; and the economic stability and growth of the Nation is threatened unless satisfactory, long-range solutions to problems of competition and rates can be found; and

Whereas regulation of freight rates by all carriers engaged in commercial transportation is necessary to protect the public interest; and it is a matter of national transportation policy that all shippers should be protected from unfair rate discrimination, place discrimination, and size discrimination; and

Whereas it is desirable and practical to limit the application of the agricultural commodity exemptions and provide the producer the unrestricted right to haul his own products to market; and

Whereas to meet nonregulated competition, regulated carriers have disrupted and deviated from the historical wheat-flour rate parity and it is further proposed to deregulate rail rates on agricultural commodities—all of which is unjustifiable and discriminatory in its effects on industry in Oklahoma and the entire Great Plains area; and

Whereas it is recognized and attention is directed to the extreme importance of the wheat-flour milling industry to the Oklahoma economy and as a preferred market for Oklahoma wheat producers, providing a desirable market for a substantial part of the wheat grown in Oklahoma each year; and

Whereas it is evident that a discriminatory differential in wheat and flour rates threatens the Great Plains area with the loss

and relocation of the flour milling industry and associated industries as well; and such changes would be disruptive of a simplified rate structure adapted to the best interests of producers, consumers, railroads, and millers; and

Whereas the Governor of Oklahoma has recognized the threat to industry in Oklahoma and the Great Plains area and has joined with the Governors of the other 10 States comprising the Great Plains to promote rate parity on grain and grain products, prevent the effects of deregulation which would be detrimental to industry in the wheat growing area of our Nation, and preserve the flour milling industry in Oklahoma: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Oklahoma Legislature (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That we respectfully submit that the effects of deregulation of commodity traffic and the chaos which would result from this action would cause a serious dislocation of industry from the Great Plains area and irreparable harm to the economy of our Nation; and that we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for fair and equitable regulation of all modes of commercial transportation and provide the Interstate Commerce Commission with the greater authority needed for full enforcement; and that such legislation should provide for the protection of the interests of the primary producer.

SEC. 2. That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit an authenticated copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States, the chairman of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate of the United States, the Governors of Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, Missouri, Kansas, and Texas, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the senate the 24th day of February, 1965.

BOYD COWDEN,
Acting President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 2d day of March 1965.

J. D. MCCARTY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

BASIL R. WILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I concur with my honored colleague the senior Senator from Oklahoma, in pointing up the seriousness of the situation, as outlined in the joint resolution which he has just presented as passed by the Oklahoma Legislature.

The imbalance in the ratio between rates charged on the transportation of wheat, as compared to flour, is a serious threat to the continuing operation of the milling industry in the Midwest. The milling industry, one of the oldest industries in the Midwest, is in jeopardy due to the recent freight rate reduction on wheat by the railroads, without a comparable reduction in rates on flour.

This imbalance of rates is causing many of the mills located in the center of the Nation's breadbasket to close down, or relocate closer to the market.

The loss of this milling industry threatens the economy of the entire Midwest.

I would, therefore, like to urge the careful study of this situation by the milling industry, the railroads, the regulatory agency, and the appropriate Senate committee, in order that a solution might be reached which would best benefit all those involved.

PROPOSED FOREIGN AID LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader. I have waited until the time used during the morning hour was taken advantage of by Senators who wished to speak, because I wished to speak for 10 minutes in regard to the introduction of a major bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President. I speak from my desk today in regard to the parliamentary strategy being followed by the administration and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in connection with the handling of foreign aid legislation this year.

For the first time since the beginning of foreign aid, we find ourselves in the parliamentary situation that the administration sends up its major message on foreign aid, but it does not contain what the American people are entitled to receive from the President—namely, his recommendation as to the legislative form to be used in carrying out his recommendations.

I am disappointed that the President has not seen fit to do so, because it goes along with the responsibilities of executive leadership. In order to evaluate the alternatives, the American people are entitled to know how the President believes foreign aid should be handled legislatively. Heretofore, major foreign aid bills have been recommended by the administration, leaving it to Congress to exercise its right of check in modifying bills, or separating them, if it sees fit.

In the past, we have always had the administration bill. This year, we do not have an official administration bill. We have an interesting set of hybrids, which I will explain in a moment.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], announced some weeks ago that if an omnibus bill were sent to Congress, he would not handle it on the floor of the Senate. That is his privilege and right. However, the handling of foreign aid legislation should not be determined for the American people by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Congress has the responsibility to determine in what format it should be handled.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee introduced what is known as the Fulbright bill, limited entirely to economic aid, separating it entirely from military aid. The administration is responding by testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee on the Fulbright bill only.

There was no meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, held by the chairman of the committee, for a decision as to what procedure should be followed. That is within the right and the prerogative of the chairman, if he wishes to follow it. This morning, I said to him in the committee that I thoroughly disapproved of having the chairman drop the Fulbright foreign aid bill into the legislative hopper, and then proceed to schedule hearings on it without at least discussing in committee what the procedure should be in respect to the issue: Should military aid in foreign aid be separated by having the Committee on Foreign Relations handle the economic aid part, and having the Armed Services Committee of the Senate handle the military aid part?

This raises a fundamental question that I would have the American people keep in mind; namely, that foreign aid of any substance in any country determines American foreign policy. The Secretary of Defense has, in effect, become the Secretary of State in too many areas of the world, including especially certain underdeveloped countries.

The senior Senator from Oregon believes that this is more than a matter of procedure. This is a matter of substance, and I publicly express my complete disapproval of the way President Johnson has handled foreign aid procedurally this year. I ask him publicly from my desk today: "Mr. President, do you wish foreign aid in an omnibus bill, or do you wish foreign aid in a series of bills, one on economic aid and one on military aid?"

I believe that the President is going to discover that there are millions of people in this country who recognize that this question does not raise merely a procedural issue but fundamental, substantive issues.

The strategy of the administration seems to be that it knows foreign aid is in trouble, it knows there is shocking waste and inefficiency involving hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in the administering of foreign aid, and it knows full well that the Comptroller General—in report after report of a confidential nature to the Congress—has found many inefficiencies. The weaknesses in foreign aid are findings which cannot stand public analysis and discussion.

Therefore, I ask the President: "Why do you not lift the top secret label from the reports of the Comptroller General?" Why conceal from the American people the facts they are entitled to know about the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars in the administration of foreign aid?

Why, Mr. President, can we not stop this march down the highway toward a government of ever-increasing execu-

tive power which is naught but a way of saying "government by concealment"?

In this session of Congress, an interesting parliamentary strategy is being followed by the President in connection with foreign aid. The executive branch offers to make its drafting services available to Congress. Heretofore, the drafting service has been rendered to the President of the United States, and after his experts and advisers in the various departments of Government connected with foreign aid had reached their policy consensus, the President then sent up a bill.

What we are seeing this year is a buck-passing performance. In times of great crisis in this country, we should stop brushing responsibilities under the rug, we should stop passing the buck under the separation of powers doctrine. The American people have a right to say to President Johnson: "What do you recommend?" The executive branch should stand up to it and tell the American people what the President will recommend—either an omnibus bill or a series of separate bills.

Of course, as a part of the strategy to get separate bills, I am satisfied that the policymakers downtown believe they will get more if they administer a series of "doses" of foreign aid, rather than to present a total bill, as has been done in the past, calling it an omnibus bill and having hearings on the entire subject matter.

In my judgment, from the standpoint of foreign policy, President Johnson cannot justify the separation of economic aid from military aid. We are entitled to look at the totality of the package in a single record made in years gone by.

I, for one, do not believe in subordinating the Department of State at any time to the Department of Defense. Although it is said that the Secretary of State has the power to veto recommendations of the Pentagon, subject to the approval of the President, in practice the Secretary of State has delegated that authority to underlings in the State Department concerned with foreign aid.

Thus, Mr. President, I do not intend to sit by and not give Congress a bill on which it can at least consider both military aid and economic aid in the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning I asked Mr. Bell in committee if they intended to testify in connection with the Fulbright bill in regard to military aid.

Since military aid is not involved in the Fulbright bill, they said they did not intend to testify unless they were requested by the committee to testify.

Then I raised a procedural point in committee. I have great respect for the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I said, "Mr. Chairman, I am very much disappointed that before we got started with these hearings you did not hold a meeting on procedure, to decide what our procedure was to be in the handling of foreign aid legislation this year."

He said he had no objection to that, if I wanted to ask for such a meeting.

I said, "I should not have to ask for it. I do ask for it."

I am assured that such a meeting will be scheduled later this week.

Mr. President, I said the administration offered to Congress the drafting service of its experts downtown. They sent up, not with the recommendation that they be introduced, but merely sent up, three drafts, one an omnibus bill, one an economic aid bill, and a bill limited to military aid.

We have here an interesting combination in the form of the Fulbright bill, which is a modification of the proposed draft of the experts of the administration on economic aid. We also have a modification of the omnibus bill introduced in the House, under the leadership of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

The bills constitute, in their totality, an interesting procedure.

I now ask unanimous consent that there may be published, at the close of my remarks, the two drafts on economic aid and on military aid, prepared by the drafting experts of the administration, and sent to Congress, but without the recommendation of the White House, that any one of the three bills be introduced.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, also the Fulbright bill and the bill that has been introduced in the House and has become known as the Morgan bill.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now introduce, in my behalf, the third bill of the so-called drafting experts of the White House. It is their omnibus bill combining all regular forms of aid in one bill. I ask that it be appropriately referred. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1524) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1524

An Act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes

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

PART I—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 101. Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is designated "Economic Assistance".

Chapter 1—Policy

SEC. 102. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the statement of policy, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend the tenth paragraph by striking out "this Act" and substituting "this part".

(b) Amend the thirteenth paragraph by inserting after the second full sentence thereof the following:

"Congress further urges that the United States and other free world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis and that the United States continue its efforts to improve coordination among programs of assistance carried out on a bilateral basis by free-world nations".

Chapter 2—Development assistance

Title I—Development Loan Fund

SEC. 103. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the development loan fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 201(c), which relates to general authority, by striking out "section 610" and "section 614(a)" and substituting "section 510" and "section 514(a)", respectively.

(b) Amend section 202(a), which relates to authorization, by striking out "601, and 602" and substituting "501, and 502".

(c) Amend section 205, relating to the use of the facilities of the International Development Association, by striking out "section 619" and substituting "section 519".

Title II—Technical Cooperation and Development Grants

SEC. 104. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 212, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$215,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$210,000,000", respectively.

(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is hereby repealed effective July 1, 1966.

(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out "1965, $18,000,000" and substituting "1966, $7,000,000".

Title III—Investment Guaranties

SEC. 105. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend the introductory clause to read as follows: "The President may issue guaranties to eligible United States investors—".

(2) In paragraph (1) strike out "$2,500,000,000" and substitute "$5,000,000,000".

(3) Amend paragraph (2) as follows:

(A) In the first proviso, strike out ", and no such guaranty in the case of a loan shall exceed $25,000,000 and no other such guaranty shall exceed $10,000,000".

(B) In the fourth proviso, strike out "1966" and substitute "1967".

(b) Amend section 221(c), which relates to general authority, by inserting after the word "guaranty" the third time it appears, the words "of an equity investment".

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by inserting after "(exclusive of informational media guaranties)," the words "and to pay the costs of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties,".

(d) Amend section 223, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and" at the end thereof and in subsection (b), strike out the period and substitute "; and".

(2) Add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) the term 'eligible United States investors' means United States citizens, or corporations, partnerships or other associations created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens, as well as foreign corporations, partnerships or other associations wholly-owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships or other associations: *Provided*, That the eligibility of a foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the United States owners."

(e) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, to read as follows:

"SEC. 224. HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES—(a) It is the sense of Congress that in order to stimulate private home ownership and assist in the development of stable economies in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects, the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible United States investors as defined in section 223 assuring against loss of loan investments made by such investors in—

"(1) pilot or demonstration private housing projects in Latin America of types similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration and suitable for conditions in Latin America;

"(2) credit institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, such as savings and loan institutions;

"(3) housing projects in Latin America for lower income families and persons, which projects shall be constructed in accordance with maximum unit costs established by the President for families and persons whose incomes meet the limitations prescribed by the President;

"(4) housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and cooperatives; or

"(5) housing projects in Latin America 25 per centum or more of the aggregate of the mortgage financing for which is made available from sources within Latin America and has not derived from sources outside Latin America, which projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, have a unit cost of not more than $6,500.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $350,000,000: *Provided*, That the total face amount of guaranties issued under subsection (b)(1) outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $250,000,000: *Provided further*, That no payment may be made under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible: *Provided further*, That this authority shall continue until June 30, 1967."

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

SEC. 106. Title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 251, which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) In subsection (c), strike out "section 614(a)" and "section 610" and substitute "section 514(a)" and "section 510", respectively.

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "this Act" and substitute "this part".

(3) In subsection (f), strike out "section 601(b)(4) of this Act" and substitute "section 501(b)(4) of this part".

(4) In subsection (g), strike out "this Act" and substitute "this part".

(b) Amend section 252, which relates to authorization, as follows:

(1) In the first sentence, strike out all after the words "until expended" and substitute the following: ": *Provided*, That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section, except for not to exceed $100,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1963 and 1964 and $85,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in each such fiscal year, shall be available only for loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars."

(2) In the third sentence, strike out "601, and 602" and substitute "501, and 502".

Chapter 3—International organizations and programs

SEC. 107. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend the first sentence by striking out "1965" and "$134,272,400" and substituting "1966" and "$155,455,000", respectively.

(b) Strike out the second sentence.

Chapter 4—Supporting assistance

SEC. 108. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out "1965" and "$405,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$369,200,000", respectively.

Chapter 5—Contingency fund

SEC. 109. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(1) Strike out "1965" and "$150,000,000" and substitute "1966" and "$50,000,000", respectively.

(2) Add the following new sentence:

"In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in Vietnam such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by parts I and II of this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided*, That the President shall present to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence.

(b) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "this section" and substituting "the first sentence of subsection (a)".

Chapter 7—General, administrative and miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 110. Part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated chapter 7 of part I, "General, Administrative and Miscellaneous Provisions".

Title I—General Provisions

SEC. 111. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is redesignated title I of chapter 7 of part I and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 601, which relates to encouragement of free enterprise and private participation, as section 501 and strike out "this Act" wherever it appears in subsections (a), (b) and (d) and the first and last times it appears in subsection (c) and substitute "this part".

(b) Redesignate section 602, which relates to small business, as section 502 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(B) In the introductory clause, strike out ", defense articles," and "(including defense services)".

(C) In paragraphs (2) and (3), strike out ", articles,".

(2) Strike out subsection (c).

(c) Redesignate section 603, which relates to shipping on United States vessels, as section 503 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "and defense articles".

(2) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(d) Redesignate section 604, which relates to procurement, as section 504 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Amend subsection (d) as follows:

(A) In the introductory clause, after "assistance" insert "under this part".

(B) In the proviso, strike out "hereunder" and substitute "under this part".

(e) Redesignate section 605, which relates to retention and use of items, as section 505, and amend said section as follows:

(1) In the section heading, insert "and Refunds" after "Items".

(2) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(3) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) In the first sentence, strike out "and defense articles".

(B) In the second and third sentences, strike out "or defense articles" wherever it appears.

(4) Add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Funds realized as a result of any failure of a transaction financed under authority of this part to conform to the requirements of this part, or to applicable rules and regulations of the United States Government, or to the terms of any agreement or contract entered into under authority of this part, shall revert to the respective appropriations, fund, or account used to finance such transaction or to the appropriation, fund or account currently available for the same general purpose."

(f) Redesignate sections 606 and 607, which relate respectively to patents and tech-

nical information and the furnishing of services and commodities, as sections 506 and 507, respectively, and amend said sections by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and substituting "this part".

(g) Redesignate section 608, which relates to advance acquisition of property, as section 508, and amend said section by striking out "section 607" wherever it appears and substituting "section 507".

(h) Redesignate section 609, which relates to the special account, as section 509.

(i) Redesignate section 610, which relates to transfer between accounts, as section 510 and amend subsection (b) of said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "510, and 614" and substitute "514, 804(a) and 902".

(2) Strike out "sections 636(g)(1) and 637" and substitute "section 536 and 925 (a) (1) and (2)".

(j) Redesignate sections 611, 612 and 613, which relate respectively to completion of plans and cost estimates, use of foreign currencies and accounting, valuation and reporting of foreign currencies, as sections 511, 512 and 513, respectively, and in redesignated section 512 redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(k) Redesignate section 614, which relates to special authorities, as section 514 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) Strike out "this Act" the first and third time it appears and substitute "this part".

(B) Strike out "and the furnishing of assistance under section 510 in a total amount not to exceed $250,000,000".

(C) Strike out the last sentence and substitute the following:

"Not more than $250,000,000 may be used under authority of this subsection and section 902(a) of this Act in any one fiscal year and not more than $50,000,000 of the funds made available under this subsection and section 902(a) may be allocated to any one country in any fiscal year."

(2) Amend subsection (c) as follows:

(A) Strike out "this Act" and substitute "this part".

(B) Strike out "amounts not to exceed $50,000,000 of the" and insert after "amounts" the following: ": *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000,000 may be used under authority of this subsection and section 902(c) of this Act."

(l) Redesignate section 615, which relates to contract authority, as section 515 and amend said section by striking out "this Act" and substituting "this part".

(m) Redesignate sections 616 and 617, which relate respectively to the availability of funds and termination of assistance, as sections 516 and 517, respectively, and amend said sections by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and substituting "this part".

(n) Redesignate sections 618 and 619, which relate respectively to the use of settlement receipts and assistance to newly independent countries, as sections 518 and 519, respectively.

(o) Redesignate section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba and certain other countries, as section 520 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears, except in subsection (d), and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (e)(1) (the introductory clause), after "under this" insert "part".

(3) In subsection (h), after "foreign aid" insert "under this part".

(4) In subsection (i), after "under this" wherever it appears insert "part".

(5) In subsection (m), strike out "(1)" and all after "1963".

Title II—Administrative Provisions

SEC. 112. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated title II of chapter 7 of part I and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 621, which relates to exercise of functions, as section 521 and amend said section by striking out "this Act" whenever it appears and substituting "this part".

(b) Redesignate section 622, which relates to coordination with foreign policy, as section 522 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "military assistance" and "economic" and substitute "economic assistance" and "military", respectively.

(3) Amend subsection (c) as follows:

(A) Strike out "a military assistance" and substitute "an economic assistance".

(B) After "abroad" insert "with programs of military assistance and sales".

(c) Section 623, which relates to the Secretary of Defense, is repealed.

(d) Redesignate section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as section 523 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "paragraph (3) of" and "of the officers provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection", and substitute for the latter "of one or more of said officers".

(2) Subsection (c) is repealed and subsection (d) is redesignated subsection (c).

(3) Amend redesignated subsection (c) as follows:

(A) Strike out "Public Law 86–735" wherever it appears and substitute "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(B) Amend paragraph (7) as follows:

(i) Strike out "this Act" the second time it appears and substitute "this part".

(ii) In the first full sentence following the proviso, strike out "section 614(a) of this Act and the provisions of section 634(c)" and substitute "sections 514(a) and 902(a) of this Act and the provisions of sections 533(c) and 926(c)".

(e) Redesignate section 625, which relates to the employment of personnel, as section 524 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Redesignate subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (j) as (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i), respectively.

(3) In redesignated subsection (c) (introductory clause), strike out "outside the United States" and in paragraph (2) strike out all after "prescribe".

(4) In redesignated subsection (d), strike out "(d)" and substitute "(c)".

(5) In redesignated subsection (e), strike out "agencies" the second time it appears and substitute "agency", and strike out "part I or part II of".

(f) Redesignate sections 626, 627 and 628, relating respectively to experts, consultants and retired officers, detail of personnel to foreign governments, detail of personnel to international organizations, as sections 525, 526, and 527, respectively, and amend said sections by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and substituting "this part".

(g) Redesignate section 629, which relates to status of personnel detailed, as section 528 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (a), strike out "section 627 or 628" and substitute "section 526 or 527".

(3) In subsection (b), strike out "section 627, 628, 631 or 624(d)" and substitute "section 523(c), 526, 527 or 530".

(h) Redesignate section 630, which relates to terms of detail or assignment, as section 529 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In the introductory clause, strike out "section 627 or 628" and substitute "section 526 or 527".

(3) In paragraph (2), after "travel expenses," insert "benefits".

(4) In paragraph (4), after "travel expenses," insert "benefits" and strike out "section 629" and substitute "section 528".

(i) Redesignate section 631, which relates to missions and staffs abroad, as section 530 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "section 625(d)" and substitute "section 524(c)".

(j) Redesignate section 632, which relates to allocation and reimbursement among agencies, as section 531 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (a), strike out ", defense articles," and "(including defense services)".

(3) In subsection (b), strike out "(including defense services)" and "and defense articles".

(4) Subsection (d) is repealed and subsections (e), (f), and (g) are redesignated (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

(5) In redesignated subsection (d), strike out "defense articles," and "(including defense services),".

(6) In redesignated subsection (f), strike out "section 637(a)" and substitute "section 536(a)".

(k) Redesignate section 633, which relates to waivers of certain laws, as section 532 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Subsection (b) is repealed and subsection (c) redesignated subsection (b).

(l) Redesignate section 634, which relates to reports and information, as section 533 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "section 303, 610, 614(a) or 614(b)" and substitute "section 303, 510, 514(a) or 514(b)".

(m) Redesignate section 635, which relates to general authorities, as section 534 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Amend subsection (h) to read as follows:

"(h) A contract or agreement which entails commitments for the expenditure of funds available under titles II and V of chapter 2 of part I and available under title VI of said chapter, to the extent such contract or agreement relates to funds not required to be made available on a dollar repayable loan basis, may, subject to any future action of the Congress, extend at any time for not more than five years."

(3) Add the following new subsection (1):

"(1) The President, when he finds it to be in the interest of the United States, is authorized to sell buildings and grounds in foreign countries acquired in connection with carrying out activities under this part, and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the proceeds of such sale may be applied toward the purchase and construction, furnishing, improvement, and preservation of other properties or held for such later use: *Provided, however*, That the President shall report all such transactions annually to the Congress with the Budget estimates of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I."

(n) Redesignate section 636, which relates to provisions on uses of funds, as section 535 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) In the introductory clause, strike out "(except for part II)".

(B) In paragraph (2), strike out "section 626" and substitute "section 525".

(C) In paragraph (5), strike out "section 631" and substitute "section 530".

(3) In subsections (c) and (d), strike out "of part I" wherever it appears.

(4) In subsection (e), strike out "of part I" and "section 625(d)(2)" and substitute for the latter "section 524(c)(2)".

(5) Amend subsection (f) as follows:

(A) Strike out "section 637(a)" and substitute "section 536(a)".

(B) Strike out "Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes" and substitute "Latin American Development Act".

(6) Subsection (g) is hereby repealed and subsection (h) redesignated subsection (g).

(o) Redesignate section 637, which relates to administrative expenses, as section 536 and amend subsection (a) of said section by striking out "1965" and "$52,500,000" and substituting "1966" and "$55,240,000", respectively.

(p) Redesignate section 638, which relates to peace corps assistance, as section 537 and amend said section by striking out all beginning with "; or famine".

(q) Add the following new section 538:

"SEC. 538. "FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF.— No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country for famine or disaster relief."

Title III—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 113. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to miscellaneous provisions, is redesignated title III of chapter 7 of part I and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 641, which relates to effective date and identification of programs, as section 541.

(b) Redesignate section 642, which relates to statutes repealed, as section 542 and amend subsection (a)(2) of said section by striking out "143," and all beginning with "*: Provided,*".

(c) Redesignate section 643, which relates to savings provisions, as section 543 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Strike out "section 642(a)" wherever it appears and substitute "section 542(a)".

(d) Redesignate section 644, which relates to definitions, as section 544 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In the introductory clause, strike out "this Act" and substitute "this part".

(2) Subsections (b), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i) and (m) are repealed and subsections (c), (h), (j), (k) and (l) are redesignated subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

(e) Redesignate section 645, which relates to unexpended balances, as section 545 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" and substitute "this part".

(2) Strike out "Public Law 86–735" and substitute "the Latin American Development Act".

(f) Redesignate sections 646, 647 and 648, which relate respectively to construction, dependable fuel supply and special authorization for use of foreign currencies, as sections 546, 547 and 548, respectively; amend redesignated section 546 by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and substituting "this part"; and amend redesignated section 548 by inserting "part" after "under this".

PART II—MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND SALES

SEC. 201. Part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is designated "Military Assistance and Sales" and is amended by striking out all of said part and substituting the following:

Chapter 1—Objectives and definitions

SEC. 600. OBJECTIVES.—It is the policy of the United States to assist friendly countries in their individual and collective self-defense efforts by making it possible for them to acquire defense articles, services, and training. This policy is based upon the principles of effective self-help and mutual aid. It is the sense of Congress that grants of defense articles should not be made to any country having sufficient resources to enable it to maintain and equip its own military forces at adequate strength without undue burden to its economy.

The Congress recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered so long as the Soviet Union and Communist China and their allies continue by threat of military action by use of economic pressure, and by internal subversion or other means, to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent, and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and countries once free but now subject to such domination.

It continues to be the intention of the United States to seek to achieve international peace and security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except for individual and collective self-defense.

The Congress reaffirms its belief in the importance of regional organizations of free people for mutual assistance, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Organization of American States, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the Central Treaty Organization, and others, and expresses its hope that such organizations may be strengthened and broadened, and their programs of self-help and mutual cooperation may be made more effective in the protection of the independence and security of free peoples, in the development of their economic and social well-being, and the safeguarding of their basic rights and liberties. The Congress welcomes, in particular, steps which have been taken to integrate and coordinate procurement, research, development, production, and logistics support of defense articles by the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It is the sense of the Congress that an important contribution toward peace would be made by the establishment of earmarked military units under the Organization of American States for peacekeeping missions in the Western Hemisphere. Similar units in other areas should be encouraged where appropriate.

In enacting this part, it is therefore the intention of Congress to promote the peace of the world and the security, foreign policy, and general welfare of the United States by fostering an improved climate of political independence and individual liberty, improving the ability of friendly countries and international organizations to deter or if necessary defeat Communist or Communist supported aggression, facilitating arrangements for individual and collective security, assisting friendly countries to maintain internal security, and creating an environment of security and stability in developing friendly countries through civic action and other programs essential to their more rapid social, economic, and political progress. The Congress urges that all other countries able to contribute join in the common undertaking to meet these goals.

SEC. 601. DEFINITIONS.—As used in this part—

(a) "Armed Forces" of the United States means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

(b) "Defense article" includes any—

(1) weapon, weapons system, munition, aircraft, vessel, boat, or other implement of war;

(2) property, installation, commodity, material, equipment, supply, or goods used for the purposes of this part;

(3) machinery, facility, tool, material, supply, or other item necessary for the manufacture, production, processing, repair, servicing, storage, construction, transportation, operation, or use of any article listed in this subsection; and

(4) component or part of any article listed in this subsection; but shall not include merchant vessels or, as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; as amended (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), source material, byproduct material, special nuclear material, or atomic weapons.

(c) "Defense information" includes any document, writing, sketch, photograph, plan, model, specification, design, prototype, drawing, technical manual, publication, or other recorded or oral information relating to any defense article or defense service, but shall not include restricted data as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and data removed from the restricted data category under section 142(d) of that Act.

(d) "Defense service" includes packing, crating, handling, transportation, and any service, test, inspection, repair, rehabilitation, technical assistance, or defense information used for the purposes of this part.

(e) "Excess defense articles" means the quantity of defense articles owned by the United States Government and not procured in anticipation of military assistance or sales requirements, or pursuant to a military assistance or sales order, which is in excess of the mobilization reserve at the time such articles are dropped from inventory by the supplying agency for delivery to countries or international organizations under this part.

(f) "Mobilization reserve" means the quantity of defense articles determined to be required, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, to support mobilization of the Armed Forces of the United States Government in the event of war or national emergency.

(g) "Officer or employee" means civilian personnel and members of the Armed Forces of the United States Government.

(h) "Training" includes—

(1) formal or informal instruction of foreign students in the United States or overseas by officers or employees of the United States, contract technicians, contractors (including instruction at civilian institutions), or by correspondence courses and technical, educational, or informational publications and media of all kinds;

(2) orientation;

(3) training exercise;

(4) defense information;

(5) training aid;

(6) military advice to foreign military units and forces; and

(7) the transfer of limited quantities of defense articles for test, evaluation, or standardization purposes.

(i) "Value" means—

(1) with respect to excess defense articles, the gross cost incurred by the United States in repairing, rehabilitating, or modifying such articles;

(2) with respect to nonexcess defense articles delivered from inventory to countries or international organizations under this part, the standard price in effect at the time such articles are dropped from inventory by the supplying agency. Such standard price shall be the same price (including authorized reduced prices) used for transfers or sales of such articles in or between the Armed Forces of the United States Government, or, where such articles are not transferred or sold in or between the Armed Forces of the United States, the gross cost to the United States Government adjusted as appropriate for condition and market value; and

(3) with respect to nonexcess defense articles delivered from new procurement to countries or international organizations under this part, the contract or production costs of such articles.

(j) "United States Government Agency" includes any agency, department, board, wholly or partly owned corporation, instrumentality, commission, or establishment of the United States Government.

Chapter 2—Military assistance

Title I—Grants of Defense Articles and Defense Services for Individual and Collective Security

SEC. 610. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President may acquire from any source and make grants of defense articles and defense services, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including loans), to any friendly country or international organization, the assisting of which the President finds will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace.

SEC. 61. PURPOSES OF GRANTS.—(a) Grants of defense articles and defense services under this title to any country may be made solely for internal security, for legitimate self-defense, to permit the recipient country to participate in regional or collective arrangements or measures consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, or otherwise to permit the recipient country to participate in collective measures requested by the United Nations for the purpose of maintaining or restoring international peace and security.

(b) To the extent feasible and consistent with the purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the use of defense articles and defense services granted under this title for such purposes by the recipient country for civic action activities authorized by title II of this chapter shall be encouraged.

SEC. 612. GENERAL CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY.—(a) In addition to such other provisions as the President may require, no defense articles shall be granted under this title to any country unless it shall have agreed that:

(1) it will not, without the consent of the President—

(A) permit any use of such articles by anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of that country,

(B) transfer, or permit any officer, employee, or agent of that country to transfer such articles by gift, sale, or otherwise, or

(C) use or permit the use of such articles for purposes other than those for which furnished;

(2) it will maintain the security of such articles, and will provide substantially the same degree of security protection afforded such articles by the United States Government;

(3) it will, as the President may require, permit continuous observation and review by, and furnish necessary information to, representatives of the United States Government with regard to the use of such articles; and

(4) unless the President consents to other disposition, it will return to the United States Government for such use or disposition as the President considers in the best interest of the United States, such articles which are no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished.

(b) No defense articles shall be granted under this title to any country of a value in excess of $3,000,000 in any fiscal year unless the President determines—

(1) that such country conforms to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations;

(2) that such defense articles will be utilized by such country for the maintenance of its own defensive strength; and the defensive strength of the free world; and

(3) that such country is taking all reasonable measures, consistent with its political and economic stability, which may be needed to develop its defense capacities.

Title II—Civic Action Assistance

SEC. 615. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President may acquire from any source and make grants of defense articles and defense services, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including loans), to any developing friendly country otherwise eligible under sections 610 and 612, for the purpose of assisting the military forces of that country (or the voluntary efforts of personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States) to construct public works and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic and social development of that country. It is the sense of the Congress that, insofar as practicable, such foreign military forces should not be maintained or established solely for civic action activities and that such civic action activities not significantly detract from the capability of the military forces to perform their military missions and be coordinated with and form part of the total economic and social development effort.

Title III—Training and Detail of Personnel

SEC. 620. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may furnish training, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, to any friendly country or international organization, eligible under section 610.

(b) Members of the Armed Forces of the United States and other personnel of the Department of Defense may be assigned or detailed under this part only to perform duties of a non-combatant nature.

SEC. 621. DETAIL OF PERSONNEL TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this part, any officer or employee of the Department of Defense may be detailed or assigned—

(1) to any office or position with any foreign government or governmental agency, where acceptance of such office or position does not involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government or the acceptance of compensation or other benefits from such foreign country by such officer or employee; or

(2) to any international organization to serve with, or as a member of, the international staff of such international organization, or to render any technical, scientific, or professional advice or services to, or in cooperation with, such organization.

SEC. 622. STATUS OF PERSONNEL ASSIGNED OR DETAILED.—(a) Any officer or employee, while assigned or detailed under section 621 of this part, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his allowances, privileges, rights, seniority, and other benefits as such, an officer or employee of the United States Government and of the activity of the Department of Defense from which detailed or assigned, and he shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from funds appropriated for that activity.

(b) Any officer or employee assigned, detailed, or appointed under section 621 of this part may receive under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1131). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all of the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 70).

SEC. 623. TERMS OF DETAIL OR ASSIGNMENT.—Details or assignment may be made under section 621 of this part—

(1) without reimbursement to the United States Government by the foreign government or international organization;

(2) upon agreement by the foreign government or international organization, to reimburse the United States Government for compensation, travel expenses, allowances, and benefits, or any part thereof, payable to the officer or employee concerned during the period of assignment or detail; and such reimbursements (including foreign currencies) shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized for paying such compensation, travel expenses, allowances, or benefits, or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for such purposes;

(3) upon an advance of funds, property, or services, by the foreign government or international organization to the United States Government accepted with the approval of the President for specified uses in furtherance of the purposes of this part; and funds so advanced may be established as a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States Government, to be available for the specified uses, and to be used for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditures subject to the provisions of this part, any unexpended balance of such account to be returned to the foreign government or international organization; or

(4) subject to the receipt by the United States Government of a credit to be applied against the payment by the United States Government of its share of the expenses of the international organization to which the officer or employee is detailed or assigned, such credit to be based upon the compensation, travel expenses, allowances, and benefits, or any part thereof, payable to such officer or employee during the period of detail or assignment in accordance with section 621 of this part.

Title IV—Collective Defense Activities

SEC. 631. INFRASTRUCTURE AND JOINT USE FACILITIES.—The President may enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements with any friendly foreign country or international organization eligible under sections 610 and 612, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including financial contributions of funds made available under this part), for the acquisition or construction of facilities for collective defense or which are to be jointly utilized by the Armed Forces of the United States and friendly foreign military forces or which may be utilized by the Armed Forces of the United States upon the implementation of contingency plans of the United States.

SEC. 632. INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS.—The President may use funds made available under this part to enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for sharing the costs of constructing, operating and maintaining international military headquarters and organizations in which the Department of Defense participates.

Title V—Restrictions on Assistance

SEC. 641. SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY.—(a) (1) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any economically developed nation capable of sustaining its own defense burden and economic growth, except (1) to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963, or (2) additional orientation and training expenses under this chapter during each fiscal year in an amount not to exceed $500,000.

(2) The President shall regularly reduce and, with such deliberate speed as orderly procedure and other relevent considerations, including prior commitments, will permit, shall terminate all further grants of defense articles to any country having sufficient resources to enable it, in the judgment of the President, to maintain and equip its own military forces at adequate strength, without undue burden to its economy.

(b) Any country which hereafter uses defense articles or defense services furnished such country under this part or any predecessor foreign assistance Act, in substantial violation of the provisions of this part or any agreement entered into pursuant to any of such Acts shall be immediately ineligible for further assistance.

(c) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any country which furnishes assistance to the present government of Cuba unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

(d) No funds authorized to be made available under this part shall be used to furnish assistance under this chapter to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

(1) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

(A) any item of economic assistance.

(B) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

(C) any other equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime; and

(2) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

(e) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter to the government of any country which is indebted to any United States citizen or person for goods or services furnished to or ordered where (i) such citizen or person has exhausted available legal remedies, which shall include arbitration, or (ii) the debt is not denied or contested by such government, or (iii) such indebtedness arises under an unconditional guaranty of payment given by such government, or any predecessor government, directly or indirectly, through any controlled entity: *Provided*, That the President does not find such action contrary to the national security.

(f) The President shall suspend assistance under this chapter to the government of any country when the government of such country or any government agency or subdivision within such country on or after January 1, 1962—

(1) has nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

(2) has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

(3) has imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned,

and such country, government agency, or government subdivision fails within a reasonable time (not more than six months after such action, or, in the event of a referral to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States within such period as provided herein, not more than twenty days after the report of the Commission is received) to take appropriate steps, which may include arbitration, to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange, equivalent to the full value thereof, as required by international law, or fails to take steps designed to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, or conditions, as the case may be; and such suspension shall continue until the President is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken, and no other provision of this part shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

Upon request of the President (within seventy days after such action referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States (established pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1954, 68 Stat. 1279) is hereby authorized to evaluate expropriated property, determining the full value of any property nationalized, expropriated, or seized, or subject to discriminatory or other actions as aforesaid, for purposes of this subsection and to render an advisory report to the President within ninety days after such request. Unless authorized by the President, the Commission shall not publish its advisory report except to the citizen or entity owning such property. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amount, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Commission to carry out expeditiously its functions under this subsection.

(g) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

(1) the United States,

(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954,

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this part.

(h) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter after December 31, 1965, to the government of any less developed country which has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221 (b) (1) of this Act, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b) (1).

SEC. 642. COUNTRIES SPECIFICALLY INELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.—(a) Except as may be deemed necessary by the President in the interest of the United States, no assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any government of Cuba, until the President determines that such government has taken appropriate steps according to international law standards to return to United States citizens, and to entities not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or to provide equitable compensation to such citizens and entities for property taken from such citizens and entities on or after January 1, 1959, by the Government of Cuba.

(b) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any Communist country. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this part unless the President finds and promptly reports to Congress that : (1) such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international communism. For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase "Communist country" shall include specifically, but not be limited to, the following countries:

Peoples Republic of Albania,
Peoples Republic of Bulgaria,
Peoples Republic of China,
Czechoslovak Socialist Republic,
German Democratic Republic (East Germany),
Estonia,
Hungarian Peoples Republic,
Latvia,
Lithuania,
North Korean Peoples Republic,
North Vietnam,
Outer Mongolia-Mongolian Peoples Republic,
Polish Peoples Republic,
Rumanian Peoples Republic,
Tibet,
Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia,
Cuba, and
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (including its captive constituent republics).

(c) No assistance under this chapter shall be furnished to Indonesia unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States. The President shall keep the Congress fully and currently informed of any assistance furnished to Indonesia under this chapter.

SEC. 643. REGIONAL RESTRICTIONS.—(a) The value of defense articles granted to American Republics (including defense articles granted in implementing a feasible plan for regional defense) under this chapter in each Fiscal Year shall not exceed $55,000,000. Except for civic action assistance, defense articles shall be granted under this chapter to any American Republic only to the extent that the President determines that such defense articles are necessary to safeguard the security of the United States, or to safeguard the security of a country associated with the United States in the Alliance for Progress against overthrow of a duly constituted government.

(b) The value of defense articles granted under this chapter to African countries in each Fiscal Year shall not exceed $25,000,000. No defense articles shall be granted under this chapter to any country in Africa except

for internal security requirements or for civic action assistance unless the President determines otherwise.

(c) Determinations under this section shall be promptly reported to the Congress.

SEC. 644. CERTIFICATION OF RECIPIENT'S CAPABILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no defense article having a value in excess of $100,000 shall hereafter be delivered to any country or international organization under the authority of this chapter unless the chief of the appropriate military assistance advisory group representing the United States with respect to defense articles used by such country or international organization, or the head of any other group representing the United States with respect to defense articles used by such country or international organization, has certified in writing within six months prior to delivery that the country or international organization has the capability to utilize effectively such article in carrying out the purposes of this chapter.

(b) Defense articles included in approved military assistance programs may be delivered to any country or international organization for which the certification required by subsection (a) of this section cannot be made when determined necessary and specifically approved in advance by the Secretary of State (or, upon appropriate delegation of authority by an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary of State) and the Secretary of Defense (or, upon appropriate delegation of authority by the Deputy Secretary or an Assistant Secretary of Defense). The Secretary of State, or his delegate, shall make a complete report to the Congress of each determination and approval and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 645. COMMINGLING OF ASSISTANCE.—The President shall adopt regulations and establish procedures to insure that assistance under this chapter is not used in a manner which, contrary to the best interests of the United States, promotes or assists the foreign aid projects or activities of the Communist-bloc countries.

Chapter 3.—Sales, barter transactions and leases

SEC. 700. OBJECTIVES.—The aim of this chapter is to advance the overall objectives of this part set forth in section 600 by facilitating the acquisition on a reimbursable basis of defense articles, defense services, and training by friendly countries having sufficient wealth to maintain and equip their own military forces wholly or in part without grant assistance. The Congress urges that, consistent with section 600, treaties and other international obligations, emphasis be given to transactions authorized by this chapter in order to promote the defensive strength of the free world. The Congress further declares that, in the administration of this chapter, participation by private enterprise should be encouraged to the maximum extent practical.

Title I—Cash Sales

SEC. 701. SALES FROM STOCK.—(a) The President may sell for United States dollars defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense and defense services and training to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 610, without reimbursement from funds available for use under this part, on terms of payment of not less than the value thereof in advance or within 120 days after the delivery of the defense articles or the provision of the defense services or training. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 601(1)(2), nonexcess defense articles may be sold under this subsection at the standard price in effect at the time such articles are offered for sale to the purchasing country or international organization. For the purpose of this subsection, the value of excess defense articles shall not be less than—

(1) the value specified in section 601(i)(1) plus the scrap value, or

(2) the market value, if ascertainable, whichever is greater.

(b) Payments received under subsection (a) of this section shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account funding the cost of the defense articles, defense services, or training sold, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

SEC. 702. PROCUREMENT FOR SALE.—(a) The President may, without requirement for any charge to any appropriation or contract authorization otherwise provided, enter into contracts for the procurement of defense articles, defense services and training for sale for United States dollars to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 610 if such country or international organization—

(1) provides the United States Government with a dependable undertaking which will assure the United States Government against any loss on the contracts, and

(2) agrees to make funds available in such amounts and at such times as may be required to meet the payments required by the contracts, and any damages and costs that may accrue from the cancellation of such contracts, in advance of the time such payments, damages or costs are due: *Provided*, That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, accept a dependable undertaking to make full payment within 120 days after delivery of the defense articles, or the provision of the defense services or training, and appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used to meet the payments required by the contracts and shall be reimbursed by the amounts subsequently received from the country or international organization: *Provided further*, That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, enter into sales agreements with purchasing countries or international organizations which fix the prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations for the defense articles, defense services, or training ordered. Funds available under this part for financing credit sales shall be used to reimburse the applicable appropriations in the amounts required by the contracts which exceed the price so fixed, except that such reimbursement shall not be required upon determination by the President that the continued production of the defense article being sold is advantageous to the Armed Forces of the United States. Payments by purchasing countries or international organizations which exceed the amounts required by such contracts shall be credited to the account established under section 712.

(b) No sales of unclassified defense articles shall be made to the government of any economically developed country under the provisions of this section unless such articles are not generally available for purchase by such countries from commercial sources in the United States. The Secretary of Defense may waive the provisions of this subsection when he determines that the waiver of such provisions is in the national interest.

Title II—Credit Sales and Guarantees

SEC. 710. GENERAL AUTHORITY FOR CREDIT SALES.—(a) The President may use funds available under this part to finance credit sales of defense articles, defense services, and training to friendly foreign countries and international organizations eligible under section 610 on such terms as he may determine, including the prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations. Reimbursement to supplying agencies shall be governed by section 802.

(b) In addition, when the President determines it to be in the national interest, sales under section 701 may be made on terms of payment of not more than three years after the delivery of the defense article or the provision of the defense service or training.

SEC. 711. GUARANTEES.—(a) The President may guaranty, insure, coinsure, and reinsure any individual, corporation, partnership, or other association doing business in the United States against political and credit risks of nonpayment arising in connection with sales financed by such individual, corporation, partnership or other association of defense articles, defense services, and training procured in the United States by friendly countries and international organizations eligible under section 610.

(b) In issuing guaranties, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance, the President may enter into contracts with exporters, insurance companies, financial institutions, or others, or groups thereof, and where appropriate may employ any of the same to act as agent in the issuance and servicing of such guaranties, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance, and the adjustment of claims arising thereunder.

(c) Fees and premiums shall be charged in connection with such contracts of guaranty, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance (excluding contracts with United States Government agencies), and such fees and premiums may be utilized to meet liabilities resulting from such contracts.

(d) Obligations shall be recorded against the funds available for credit sales in an amount not less than 25 per centum of the contractual liability related to any guaranty, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance issued pursuant to this section, and the funds so obligated, together with fees and premiums, shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims under such contracts. Any guaranties, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance issued pursuant to this section shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

SEC. 712. REIMBURSEMENTS.—(a) Whenever funds available under this part are used to finance credit sales, repayments in United States dollars (including dollar proceeds derived from the sale of foreign currency repayments), receipts received from the disposition of evidences of indebtedness, and charges (including fees and premiums) or interest collected shall be credited to a separate fund account, and shall be available until expended solely for the purpose of financing credit sales, including the overhead costs thereof.

(b) All assets and obligations of the military sales credit account administratively established on the books of the Treasury pursuant to section 508 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, including proceeds receivable from previous credit sales transactions, and such amounts of the appropriations authorized under this part as may be determined by the President, shall be transferred or credited to the separate fund account established under section 712(a) and shall be available until expended solely for the purpose of financing credit sales, including the overhead costs thereof.

SEC. 713. FOREIGN CURRENCIES.—Sales financed under this title may provide for payment in foreign currencies only to the extent that the Secretary of the Treasury determines at the time of each such sale that the existing or anticipated requirements for such foreign currencies for payment of United States obligations abroad are such that an excess of United States Government holdings of any particular foreign currency is not likely to result.

SEC. 714. COLLECTIONS.—In carrying out this title, the President—

(1) may acquire and dispose of, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine, any evidence of indebtedness; and

(2) may collect or compromise any indebtedness owed to the Department of Defense by foreign countries or international organizations.

Title III—Barter Transactions

SEC. 720. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may, without reimbursement from funds available for use under this part, barter defense articles which are in the stocks of the Department of Defense or which the Department of Defense is authorized to procure under other provisions of law, defense services, and training with any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 610 in exchange for other defense articles, defense services, and training of approximately equal or equivalent value for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) The President may, subject to the provisions of section 802, also use funds available to carry out this part to acquire defense articles, defense services, and training from any source and barter such defense articles, defense services, or training with any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 610 in exchange for other defense articles, defense services, or training.

SEC. 721. DISPOSITION OF DEFENSE ARTICLES, DEFENSE SERVICES, AND TRAINING RECEIVED IN EXCHANGE UNDER SECTION 720(b).—Defense articles, defense services, and training received by the United States Government from a country or international organization in exchange for defense articles, defense services, and training bartered by the United States Government under section 720(b) may be used to carry out this part, may be sold (on cash or credit terms, including payment in foreign currencies) to any friendly country or international organization, or may be transferred to any United States Government Agency for stockpiling or other purposes. If such disposal or transfer is made subject to reimbursement, the funds so received shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account which funded the cost of the defense articles, defense services, or training bartered to the country or international organization, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purposes.

Title IV—Leases

SEC. 731. LEASES.—(a) The President may, subject to section 802, use funds available to carry out this part to acquire defense articles from any source and lease such defense articles, on such terms and conditions of payment as he may determine, to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 610.

(b) Payments received under this section shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account funding the cost of the defense articles leased, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

Title V—General Provisions

SEC. 741. PURPOSES.—Defense articles, defense services, and training may be sold, bartered, or leased under this chapter to eligible countries solely for the purposes specified in sections 611 and 615.

Chapter 4—Fiscal provisions

SEC. 801. ALLOCATIONS.—The President may allocate to any United States Government Agency any part of any funds available for carrying out the purposes of this part, including any advance to the United States Government by any country or international organization, for the procurement of defense articles, defense services, and training. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure for the purposes for which authorized, in accordance with authority granted in this part or under authority governing the activities of the United States Government Agencies to which such funds are allocated.

SEC. 802. REIMBURSEMENTS.—(a) Except as otherwise provided in this part, reimbursement shall be made to any activity of the Department of Defense and to any other United States Government Agency, from funds available for use under this part for defense articles, defense services, and training furnished to foreign countries and international organizations by, or through, such activity or agency under this part. Such reimbursement shall be in an amount equal to the value (as defined in section 601) of the defense articles, defense services, and training furnished, plus expenses arising from or incident to operations under this part (other than pay and allowances of members of the Armed Forces). The amount of such reimbursement shall be credited to the current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts of such activity.

(b) Orders to a supplying agency under this part shall be based upon the best estimates of stock status and prevailing prices; reimbursements to the supplying agency shall be made on the basis of the stock status and prices determined pursuant to section 601(i). Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Secretary of Defense may prescribe regulations authorizing reimbursements to the supplying agency based on negotiated prices for aircraft, vessels, plant equipment, and such other major items as he may specify: *Provided,* That such articles are not excess at the time such prices are negotiated: *Provided further,* That such prices are negotiated at the time firm orders are placed with the supplying agency.

SEC. 203. APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Part not to exceed $1,170,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1966, which shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 804. SPECIAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may, if he determines it to be vital to the security of the United States, order defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense and defense services and training for the purpose of this part without reimbursement therefor from appropriations available for military assistance. The value of such orders shall not exceed $300,000,000 during each fiscal year. Prompt notice of action taken under this subsection shall be given to the Congress.

(b) The Department of Defense is authorized to incur, in applicable appropriations, obligations in amounts equivalent to orders under subsection (a) of this section. Appropriations of such sums as may be necessary to liquidate the obligations so incurred are hereby authorized.

SEC. 805. LETTERS OF COMMITMENT.—In carrying out this part, accounts may be established on the books of the Department of Defense (1) against which letters of commitment may be issued which shall constitute recordable obligations of the United States Government and moneys due or to become due under such letters of commitment shall be assignable under the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended (second and third paragraphs of 31 U.S.C. 203 and 41 U.S.C. 15), and (2) from which disbursements may be made to recipient countries or agencies, organizations, or persons upon presentation of contracts, invoices, or other appropriate documentation. Expenditures of funds which have been made available through accounts so established shall be accounted for on standard documentation required for expenditure of funds of the United States Government: *Provided,* That such expenditures for defense articles, defense services, and training procured outside the United States shall be accounted for exclusively on such certification as may be prescribed in regulations approved by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Chapter 5—General, administrative, and miscellaneous provisions

Title I—General Provisions

SEC. 901. GENERAL AUTHORITIES.—(a) The President may make and perform agreements and contracts with, or enter into other transactions with, any individual, corporation, or other body of persons, or government agency, whether within or without the United States, and international organization in furtherance of the purposes, and within the limitations, of this part.

(b) A contract under this part may, subject to future action of the Congress, extend at any time for not more than five years.

(c) The President may accept and use in furtherance of the purposes of this part, money, funds, property, and services of any kind made available by gift, devise, bequest, grant, or otherwise for such purposes.

(d) Any officer of the United States Government carrying out functions under this part may utilize the services and facilities of, or procure defense articles from, any United States Government agency with the consent of the head of such agency, or as the President shall direct, and funds allocated pursuant to this subsection to any such agency may be established in separate transfer appropriation accounts on the books of the Treasury.

SEC. 902. WAIVER AUTHORITIES.—(a) The President may authorize in each fiscal year the use of funds made available for use under this part and the furnishing of assistance under section 804 without regard to the provisions of this part, any Act appropriating funds for use under this Act, or the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, in furtherance of any of the purposes of this part and such Acts, when he determines that such authorization is important to the security of the United States. Not more than $250,000,000 may be used under authority of this subsection and section 514(a) of this Act in any one fiscal year and not more than $50,000,000 of the funds made available under this subsection and section 514(a) may be allocated to any one country in any fiscal year. Each determination shall be reported promptly to the Congress.

(b) Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this part, the functions authorized under this part may be performed without regard to such provisions of law (other than the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1211 et seq.)) regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts and the expenditure of funds of the United States Government as the President may specify.

(c) The President is authorized to use funds available for use under this part pursuant to his certification that it is inadvisable to specify the nature of the use of such funds, which certification shall be deemed to be a sufficient voucher for such amounts: *Provided,* That not to exceed $50,000,000 may be used under authority of this subsection and section 514(c) of this Act.

(d) The functions authorized under this part may be performed without regard to such provisions as the President may specify of the joint resolution of November 4, 1939 (54 Stat. 4), as amended.

(e) The provisions of section 955 of title 18 of the United States Code shall not apply

to prevent any person, including any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, from acting for, or participating in, any operation or transaction arising under this part or from acquiring new obligations issued in connection with any operation or transaction arising under this part.

SEC. 903. RETENTION AND USE OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—(a) Any defense articles procured to carry out this part may be retained by, or transferred to, and for the use of, such United States Government Agency as the Presidency may determine in lieu of being disposed of to a foreign country or international organization, whenever in the judgment of the President the best interests of the United States will be served thereby. Any defense articles so retained may be disposed of without regard to provisions of law relating to the disposal of property owned by the United States Government, when necessary to prevent spoilage or wastage of such defense articles or to conserve the usefulness thereof. Funds realized from any transfer or disposal shall revert to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

(b) Funds realized by the United States Government from the sale, transfer, or disposal of defense articles returned to the United States Government by a recipient country or international organization as no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished shall be credited to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

SEC. 904. ORDERLY TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Funds made available under this part shall remain available for a period of not to exceed twelve months from the date of termination of assistance or related activities to or with a foreign country or international organization for the necessary expenses of winding up programs related thereto.

SEC. 905. PATENTS AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION.—(a) Whenever, in connection with the performance of functions under this part—

(1) an invention or discovery covered by a patent issued by the United States Government is practiced within the United States without the authorization of the owner, or

(2) information, which is (A) protected by law, and (B) held by the United States Government subject to restrictions imposed by the owner, is disclosed by the United States Government or any of its officers, employees, or agents in violation of such restrictions, the exclusive remedy of the owner, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, is to sue the United States Government for reasonable and entire compensation for such practice or disclosure in the district court of the United States for the district in which such owner is a resident, or in the Court of Claims, within six years after the cause of action arises. Any period during which the United States Government is in possession of a written claim under subsection (b) of this section before mailing a notice of denial of that claim does not count in computing the six years. In any such suit, the United States Government may plead any defense that may be pleaded by a private person in such an action. A Government employee shall have the right to bring suit against the Government under this section except where he was in a position to order, influence, or induce use of the invention by the Government. This section shall not confer a right of action on any patentee or any assignee of such patentee with respect to any invention discovered or invented by a person while in the employment or service of the United States, where the invention was related to the official functions of the employee, in cases in which such functions included research and development, or in the making of which Government time, materials or facilities were used.

(b) Before suit against the United States Government has been instituted, the head of the agency of the United States Government concerned may settle and pay any claim arising under the circumstances described in subsection (a) of this section. No claim may be paid under this subsection unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

SEC. 906. SHIPPING ON UNITED STATES VESSELS.—The ocean transportation between foreign countries of defense articles purchased with foreign currencies made available or derived from funds available under this part or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), shall not be governed by the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), or any other law relating to the ocean transportation of defense articles on United States vessels.

SEC. 907. PROCUREMENT OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Funds available under this part may be used for procurement of defense articles outside the United States only if the President determines that such procurement will not result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States or the industrial mobilization base, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus or to the net position of the United States in its balance of payments with the rest of the world, which outweigh the economic or other advantages to the United States of less costly procurement outside the United States.

Title II—Administrative Provisions

SEC. 920. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise any functions conferred upon him by this part through such agency or officer of the United States Government as he shall direct. The head of any such agency or such officer may from time to time promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out such functions, and may delegate authority to perform any such functions, including if he shall so specify, the authority successively to redelegate any of such functions to any of his subordinates.

SEC. 921. THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—(a) With respect to programs authorized by this part, the Secretary of Defense shall have primary responsibility for—

(1) the determination of military end-item requirements;

(2) the procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs;

(3) the supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries;

(4) the supervision of the training of foreign military personnel;

(5) the movement and delivery of military end-items; and

(6) within the Department of Defense, the performance of any other functions with respect to programs authorized by this part.

(b) The establishment of priorities in the procurement, delivery, and allocation of military equipment shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 922. COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY.—(a) Nothing contained in this part shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

(b) The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the chief of the United States diplomatic mission. The chief of the diplomatic mission shall make sure that recommendations of such representatives pertaining to military assistance and sales are coordinated with political and economic considerations, and his comments shall accompany such recommendations if he so desires.

(c) Under the direction of the President, the Secretary of State shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and general direction of the programs authorized by this part, including but not limited to determining whether there shall be a military assistance or sales program for a country and the value thereof, to the end that such programs are effectively integrated both at home and abroad with programs of economic assistance and the foreign policy of the United States is best served thereby.

SEC. 923. MISSIONS AND STAFFS ABROAD.—The President may maintain special missions or staffs outside the United States in such countries and for such periods of time as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

SEC. 924. EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL.—(a) For the purposes of performing functions under this part outside the United States the President may employ or assign persons compensated at any of the rates provided for the Foreign Service Reserve and Staff by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), together with allowances and benefits thereunder. Persons so employed or assigned shall be entitled, except to the extent that the President may specify otherwise in cases in which the period of employment or assignment exceeds thirty months, to the same benefits as are provided by section 528 of that Act for persons appointed to the Foreign Service Reserve, and the provisions of section 1005 of that Act shall apply in the case of such persons, except that policymaking officials shall not be subject to that part of section 1005 of that Act which prohibits political tests.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 3544(b) and 8544(b) of title 10 of the United States Code, personnel of the Department of Defense may be assigned or detailed to any civil office to carry out this part.

SEC. 925. EXPENSES.—(a) Funds made available for the purpose of this part shall be available for—

(1) administrative and operating expenses;

(2) extraordinary expenses of not to exceed $300,000 in any fiscal year; and

(3) constructing or otherwise acquiring outside the United States essential living quarters, office space, and necessary supporting facilities for use of personnel carrying out activities authorized by this part.

(b) Actual expenses incurred by military officers detailed or assigned as tour directors in connection with orientation visits of foreign military personnel may be reimbursed in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 836), applicable to civilian officers and employees.

SEC. 926. REPORTS AND INFORMATION.—The President shall, while funds made available for the purposes of this part remain available for obligation, transmit to the Congress after the close of each fiscal year a report concerning operations in that fiscal year under this part.

(b) The President shall, in the reports required by subsection (a) of this section, and in response to requests from Members of the Congress or inquiries from the public, make public all information concerning operations under this part not deemed by him to be incompatible with the security of the United States.

(c) None of the funds made available pursuant to the provisions of this part shall be used to carry out any provision of this

part in any country or with respect to any project or activity, after the expiration of the thirty-five-day period which begins on the date the General Accounting Office or any committee of the Congress charged with considering legislation, appropriations or expenditures under this part, has delivered to the office of the head of any agency carrying out such provision, a written request that it be furnished any document, paper, communication, audit, review, finding, recommendation, report, or other material in its custody or control relating to the administration of such provision in such country or with respect to such project or activity, unless and until there has been furnished to the General Accounting Office, or to such committee, as the case may be, (1) the document, paper, communication, audit, review, finding, recommendation, report, or other material so requested, or (2) a certification by the President that he has forbidden the furnishing thereof pursuant to request and his reason for so doing.

(b) At the end of each fiscal year, the President shall notify each committee of the Congress charged with considering legislation or appropriations under this part of all actions taken during the fiscal year under this part which resulted in furnishing assistance of a kind, for a purpose, or to an area, substantially different from that included in the presentation to the Congress during its consideration of this part or any Act appropriating funds pursuant to authorizations contained in this part, or which resulted in obligations or reservations greater by 50 per centum or more than the proposed obligations or reservations included in such presentation for the program concerned, and in his notification the President shall state the justification for such changes. There shall also be included in the presentation material submitted to the Congress during its consideration of amendments to this part, or of any Act appropriating funds pursuant to authorizations contained in this part, a comparison of the current fiscal year programs and activities with those presented to the Congress in the previous year and an explanation of any substantial changes.

Title III—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 940. PROVISIONS OF LAW REPEALED AND AMENDED.—(a) References to the statutory provisions of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, contained in other Acts shall hereafter be considered to be references to the appropriate provisions of this part.

(b) Section 625(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated as section 927 of this part.

SEC. 941. SAVING PROVISIONS.—(a) Except as may be expressly provided to the contrary in this part, all determinations, authorizations, regulations, orders, contracts, agreements, and other actions issued, undertaken, or entered into under authority of any provision of law repealed by this part or Acts superseded by those provisions, shall continue in full force and effect until modified by appropriate authority.

(b) Wherever provisions of this part establish conditions which must be complied with before use may be made of authority contained in, or funds authorized by, this part, compliance with, or satisfaction of, substantially similar conditions under provisions of law repealed by this part, or Acts superseded by those provisions, shall be deemed to constitute compliance with the conditions established by this part.

(c) Funds made available pursuant to provisions of law repealed by this part shall, unless otherwise authorized or provided by law, remain available for their original purposes in accordance with the provisions of law currently applicable to those purposes.

SEC. 942. UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Unexpended balances of funds made available pursuant to this part are hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated.

SEC. 943. CONSTRUCTION.—If any provisions of this part or the application of any provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this part, and of the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say that I do this to draw the issue. The administration cannot now say that there has not been introduced in the Senate a bill covering both military and economic aid.

I would vote against the bill in this form, as I voted against its major provisions in the past 2 years.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I do not intend to abdicate to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate the responsibility of the Foreign Relations Committee over foreign affairs. The Armed Services Committee of the Senate has primary jurisdiction in regard to legislation which involves the defenses of this country. However, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate should not be given authority over the foreign affairs of this country in respect to the direct relationship between foreign relations and military aid. Military aid is basically and primarily foreign affairs. I do not intend to help make the Secretary of Defense in any particular the Secretary of State in respect to foreign affairs.

I shall introduce a second bill, before the week is over. We are going to get a very limited hearing in the Foreign Relations Committe if we stand with the Fulbright bill alone, with nothing but hearings on economic aid. So in addition to the omnibus bill I have just offered, I shall introduce a foreign aid bill of my own, seeking to carry out the recommendations that many Senators have voted for in the past 3 years. Interestingly enough, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has stated for 2 years in the reports that he has written and filed with the Senate that the recommendations involve proposals having great merit; and for the past 2 years he has recommended that the administration take action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I have said for 2 years, we should not pass the buck to the administration. Under our separation-of-powers doctrine, we have the responsibility of passing a foreign aid bill that we think ought to be the foreign aid policy of this Republic. The President has his checking right to veto it if he thinks it should be vetoed, and to see whether Congress wishes to override his veto. However, to say, as a majority of the Foreign Relations Committee have said for the past 2 years, "You ought to do something about the criticisms of foreign aid and come forward with a program that eliminates the abuses," and not do something itself, as a committee, is a failure of the committee to do its job.

The legislation which I shall introduce later this week, on which I shall ask for hearings, seeks to correct the abuses and the mistakes, the inefficiency and waste and, in some instances, the corruption that foreign aid has caused in too many countries of the world, where it has resulted in corrupting local politicians to the great detriment of the country concerned. In some areas, it has been one of the greatest boons to the spread of communism, although its intention was not that.

The military aspect of much of our foreign aid in some of the underdeveloped areas of the world has been of great assistance to the Communists, because they have been able to use it to stir up opposition to the United States and to their local government.

Lastly, as I said in the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, I shall not permit steamroller tactics to speed the foreign aid legislation through either the committee or the Senate.

It may be that in the committee the majority will have the votes to prevent thorough hearings on the Fulbright bill, the administration omnibus bill, which I have now introduced, and the Morse bill. However, as I said in committee this morning, I shall make my record, step by step, calling for thorough hearings on each of these bills, and on each segment of each bill.

As I said in committee this morning, I shall not in any way seek to use dilatory tactics, but in the consideration of the foreign aid bill I intend to have a full discussion and consideration of each segment of foreign aid, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

I owe it to the people I represent. I owe it, in my judgment, to the people of the country. This is the year in which we ought to carry out the promises that have been made in the past 3 years, to do something about cleaning up foreign aid.

As I listened to the Secretary of State and to Mr. Bell and his assistants, I could not see any change or improvement in the administration of foreign aid, either procedurally or in correcting the substantive weaknesses of foreign aid.

I close by saying, as I said before, that I am sorry that the administration did not see fit to hold a series of informal conferences, which were promised last year to those of us in opposition to foreign aid, to see if we could not narrow our areas of disagreement, because in many respects in foreign aid the senior Senator from Oregon would vote for more money than the administration recommends.

For example, the economic aspects of the Alliance for Progress; for example, some of the economic aspects of the great needs in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, before I can vote for that sort of bill, I must do what I can to eliminate from the administration's program the waste and inefficiency that has existed for too long in American foreign aid—the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars over the years of foreign aid, in

a foreign aid program that since 1946 has run in the neighborhood of $110 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. MORSE. When the President talks about a bare bones program this year of $3,380 million, he forgets to tell the American people that the total foreign assistance program is closer to $7 billion. It is labels that make the difference. But it is taxpayers' money in each instance, and the total foreign assistance program in this Republic to the various countries of the world is nearer, may I say, $7 billion than the President's figure of $3,380 million is near $4 billion.

EXHIBIT 1

ECONOMIC

An act to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by furnishing economic assistance to friendly countries and areas and to international organizations, and for other purposes

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

SEC. 101. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is further amended by striking out "PART I" after the enacting clause.

CHAPTER 1—POLICY

SEC. 102. Chapter 1 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to policy, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 102, which relates to the statement of policy, as follows:

(1) Amend the fifth, seventh, twelfth, and thirteenth paragraphs by striking out "this part" wherever it appears and substituting "this Act".

(2) Amend the sixth paragraph by striking out "of all parts" in the last sentence thereof.

(3) Amend the thirteenth paragraph by inserting after the second full sentence thereof the following: "Congress further urges that the United States and other free-world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis and that the United States continue its efforts to improve coordination among programs of assistance carried out on a bilateral basis by free-world nations".

(b) Add a new section 103 as follows:

"SEC. 103. COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY.—(a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

"(b) The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the chief of the United States diplomatic mission. The chief of the diplomatic mission shall make sure that recommendations of such representatives pertaining to programs under this Act are coordinated with recommendations pertaining to programs under the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965 and are coordinated with political considerations, and his comments shall accompany such recommendations if he so desires.

"(c) Under the direction of the President, the Secretary of State shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and general direction of assistance programs authorized by this Act and of programs authorized under the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965, including but not limited to determining whether there shall be an economic assistance or a military assistance or sales program for a country and the value thereof, to the end that such programs are effectively integrated both at home and abroad and the foreign policy of the United States is best served thereby."

CHAPTER 2—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Title I—Development Loan Fund

SEC. 103. Title I of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 201(c), which relates to general authority, by striking out "section 610" and "section 614(a)" and substituting "section 510" and "section 514(a)", respectively.

(b) Amend section 202, which relates to authorization, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "601, and 602" and substitute "501, and 502".

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "this part" and substitute "this Act".

(c) Amend section 205, relating to the use of the facilities of the International Development Association, by striking out "section 619" and substituting "section 519".

Title II—Technical cooperation and development grants

SEC. 104. Title II of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 212, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$215,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$210,000,000", respectively.

(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is hereby repealed effective July 1, 1966.

(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out "1965, $18,000,000" and substituting "1966, $7,000,000".

Title III—Investment guaranties

SEC. 105. Title III of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend the introductory clause to read as follows: "The President may issue guaranties to eligible United States investors—".

(2) In paragraph (1), strike out "$2,500,000,000" and substitute "$5,000,000,000".

(3) Amend paragraph (2) as follows:

(A) In the first proviso, strike out ", and no such guaranty in the case of a loan shall exceed $25,000,000 and no other such guaranty shall exceed $10,000,000".

(B) In the fourth proviso, strike out "1966" and substitute "1967".

(b) Amend section 221(c), which relates to general authority, by inserting after the word "guaranty" the third time it appears, the words "of an equity investment".

(c) Amend section 222, which relates to general provisions, as follows:

(1) Strike out "this part" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(2) Insert after "(exclusive of informational media guaranties)," the words "and to pay the costs of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties".

(d) Amend section 223, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and" at the end thereof and in subsection (b), strike out the period and substitute "; and".

(2) Add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) the term 'eligible United States investors' means United States citizens, or corporations, partnerships or other associations created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens, as well as foreign corporations, partnerships or other associations wholly owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships or other associations: *Provided,* That the eligibility of a foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the United States owners."

(e) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, to read as follows:

"SEC. 224. HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES.—(a) It is the sense of the Congress that in order to stimulate private home ownership and assist in the development of stable economies in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects, the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible United States investors as defined in section 223 assuring against loss of loan investments made by such investors in—

"(1) pilot or demonstration private housing projects in Latin America of types similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration and suitable for conditions in Latin America;

"(2) credit institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, such as savings and loan institutions;

"(3) housing projects in Latin America for lower income families and persons, which projects shall be constructed in accordance with maximum unit costs established by the President for families and persons whose incomes meet the limitations prescribed by the President;

"(4) housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and cooperatives; or

"(5) housing projects in Latin America 25 per centum or more of the aggregate of the mortgage financing for which is made available from sources within Latin America and has not been derived from sources outside Latin America, which projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, have a unit cost of not more than $6,500.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $350,000,000: *Provided,* That the total face amount of guaranties issued under subsection (b)(1) outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $250,000,000: *Provided further,* That no payment may be made under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible: *Provided further,* That this authority shall continue until June 30, 1967."

Title V—Development research

SEC. 106. Title V of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development research, is

amended by striking out "this part" and substituting "this Act".

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

SEC. 107. Title VI of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 251, which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (c) as follows:

(A) Strike out "section 614(a)" and "section 610" and substitute "section 514(a)" and "section 510", respectively.

(B) Strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(2) In subsection (f), strike out "section 601(b)(4)" and "part I" and substitute "section 501(b)(4)" and "this Act", respectively.

(b) Amend section 252, which relates to authorization, as follows:

(1) In the first sentence strike out all after the words "until expended" and substitute the following: ": *Provided*, That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropirated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropirated for such subsequent fiscal year. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section, except for not to exceed $100,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1963 and 1964 and $85,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in each such fiscal year, shall be available only for loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars."

(2) In the last sentence, strike out "601, and 602" and substitute "501, and 502".

(c) Amend section 253, which relates to fiscal provisions by striking out "of part I".

CHAPTER 3—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 108. Chapter 3 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 301, which relates to general authority, by striking out "this part" and substituting "this Act".

(b) Amend section 302, which relates to authorization, as follows:

(1) In the first sentence strike out "1965" and "$134,272,400" and substitute "1966" and "$155,455,000", respectively.

(2) Strike out the second sentence.

(c) Amend section 303, which relates to Indus Basin development, by striking out "(other than part II)".

CHAPTER 4—SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 109. Chapter 4 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 401, which relates to general authority, by striking out "this part" and substituting "this Act".

(b) Amend section 402, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$405,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$369,200,000," respectively.

CHAPTER 5—CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 110. Chapter 5 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(1) Strike out "1965" and "$150,000,000" and substitute "1966" and "$50,000,000", respectively.

(2) Strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(3) Add the following new sentence:

"In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in Vietnam such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided*, That the President shall present to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence."

(b) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "this section" and substituting "the first sentence of subsection (a)".

CHAPTER 7—GENERAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 111. Part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated chapter 7, "General, Administrative, and Miscellaneous Provisions".

Title I—General Provisions

SEC. 112. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is redesignated title I of chapter 7 and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 601, which relates to encouragement of free enterprise and private participation, as section 501 and, in subsection (c)(1), strike out "part I of".

(b) Redesignate section 602, which relates to small business, as section 502 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) In the introductory clause, strike out ", defense articles," and "(including defense services)".

(B) In paragraphs (2) and (3), strike out ", articles,".

(2) Strike out subsection (c).

(c) Redesignate section 603, which relates to shipping on United States vessels, as section 503 and amend said section by striking out "and defense articles".

(d) Redesignate section 604, which relates to procurement, as section 504.

(e) Redesignate section 605, which relates to retention and use of items, as section 505, and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) In the first sentence strike out "and defense articles".

(B) In the second and third sentences, strike out "or defense articles" wherever it appears.

(2) Add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Funds realized as a result of any failure of a transaction financed under authority of this Act to conform to the requirements of this Act, or to applicable rules and regulations of the United States Government, or to the terms of any agreement or contract entered into under authority of this Act, shall revert to the respective appropriations, fund or account used to finance such transaction or to the appropriation, fund or account currently available for the same general purpose."

(f) Redesignate sections 606 and 607, which relate respectively to patents and technical information and furnishing of services and commodities, as sections 506 and 507, respectively, and amend redesignated section 507 by striking out "of part I".

(g) Redesignate section 608, which relates to advance acquisition of property, as section 508, and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "section 607" wherever it appears and substitute "section 507".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "to the provisions of part I or" and substitute "to the provisions of this Act for which funds are authorized for the furnishing of assistance or pursuant to".

(3) Strike out "part I" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(h) Redesignate section 609, which relates to the special account, as section 509, and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) In the introductory clause, strike "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(B) In paragraph (3), insert "or the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965" after "this Act".

(2) Amend subsection (b), by striking out "under this Act".

(i) Redesignate section 610, which relates to transfer between accounts, as section 510 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) After "this Act" the first time it appears insert "and the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965."

(B) Strike out "this Act" the second and third time it appears and substitute "said Acts".

(2) Amend subsection (b) as follows:

(A) Strike out "510 and 614" and substitute "and 514".

(B) Strike out "sections 636(g)(1) and 637" and substitute "section 535".

(j) Redesignate sections 611 and 612, which relate respectively to completion of plans and cost estimates and to the use of foreign currencies, as sections 511 and 512, respectively, and amend said sections as follows:

(1) Strike out "part I" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(2) In redesignated section 512, redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(k) Redesignate section 613, which relates to the accounting, valuation, and reporting of foreign currencies, as section 513.

(l) Redesignate section 614, which relates to special authorities, as section 514 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and the furnishing of assistance under section 510" and "$250,000,000" and substitute for the latter "$125,000,000".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(3) In subsection (c), strike out "$50,000,000" and substitute "$25,000,000".

(m) Redesignate sections 615, 616, and 617, which relate respectively to contract authority, to availability of funds and to termination of assistance, as sections 515, 516, and 517, respectively.

(n) Redesignate section 618, which relates to use of settlement receipts, as section 518, and strike out "of part I" and "that part" and substitute for the latter "this Act".

(o) Redesignate section 619, which relates to assistance to newly independent countries, as section 519, and amend said section by striking out "part I of".

(p) Redesignate section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba and certain other countries, as section 520 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (h), strike out "foreign aid" and substitute "assistance under this Act".

(2) In subsection (m), strike out "(1)" and all after "1963".

Title II—Administrative provisions

SEC. 113. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated title II of chapter 7 and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 621, which relates to exercise of functions, as section 521.

(b) Sections 622 and 623, which relate respectively to coordination with foreign policy, and to the Secretary of Defense, are repealed.

(c) Redesignate section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as section 522 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "paragraph (3) of" and "of the officers provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection", and substitute for the latter "of one or more of said officers".

(3) Subsection (c) is hereby repealed and subsection (d) is redesignated subsection (c).

(4) Amend redesignated subsection (c) as follows:

(A) Strike out "Public Law 86–735" wherever it appears and substitute "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(B) In paragraph (2)(A), strike out "part I of".

(C) Amend paragraph (2)(B) as follows:

(i) Strike out "of assistance being carried out under part II of this Act and" and substitute "being carried out under the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965 and programs of assistance being carried out under".

(ii) After "objectives of this Act" insert "and the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965".

(iii) Strike out all after "audits" and substitute "of such programs as he considers necessary".

(D) In paragraph (4), strike out "this Act" and substitute "paragraph (2) of this subsection."

(E) Amend paragraph (5) as follows:

(i) Strike out "under this Act" and substitute "under paragraph (2) of this subsection".

(ii) Strike out "part I or part II of this Act," and substitute "this Act, the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965,".

(F) In paragraph (6), strike out "part II of this Act," and substitute "the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965".

(G) Amend paragraph (7), as follows:

(i) Strike out "part I or part II of this Act," and substitute "this Act, the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965,".

(ii) In the proviso, strike out "the Act" and substitute "this Act or the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965."

(iii) In the first full sentence following the proviso, strike out "section 614(a) of this Act and the provisions of section 634(c) of this Act" and substitute "section 514(a) of this Act and in section 132(a) of the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965 and the provisions of section 532(c) of this Act and section 147(c) of the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965."

(d) Redesignate section 625, which relates to the employment of personnel, as section 523 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "part I or coordinate part I and II" and substitute "this Act or coordinate this Act and the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965".

(2) Redesignate subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) as (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i), respectively.

(3) In redesignated subsection (c) (introductory clause), strike out "outside the United States" and in paragraph (2) strike out all after "prescribe".

(4) In redesignated subsection (d), strike out "(d)" and substitute "(c)".

(5) In redesignated subsection (e), strike out "agencies" the second time it appears and substitute "agency" and strike out "part I or part II of".

(e) Redesignate section 626, 627, and 628, relating respectively to experts, consultants, and retired officers, to detail of personnel to foreign governments, and to detail of personnel to international organizations, as sections 524, 525, and 526, respectively.

(f) Redesignate section 629, which relates to status of personnel detailed, as section 527 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "section 627 or 628" and substitute "section 525 or 526".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "section 627, 628, 631, or 624(d)" and substitute "section 522(c), 525, 526, or 529".

(g) Redesignate section 630, which relates to terms of detail or assignment, as section 528 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In the introductory clause, strike out "section 627 or 628" and substitute "section 525 or 526".

(2) In paragraph (2), after "travel expenses," insert "benefits".

(3) In paragraph (4), after "travel expenses," insert "benefits" and strike out "section 629" and substitute "section 527".

(h) Redesignate section 631, which relates to missions and staffs abroad, as section 529, and amend subsection (b) of said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(2) Strike out "section 625(d)" and substitute "section 523(c)".

(i) Redesignate section 632, which relates to allocation and reimbursement among agencies, as section 530 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out ", defense articles," and "(including defense services)".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "(including defense services)" and "and defense articles".

(3) In subsection (c), strike out "part I" and "such part" and substitute "this Act".

(4) Subsection (d) is repealed and subsections (e), (f), and (g) are redesignated (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

(5) In redesignated subsection (d), strike out "defense articles," and "(including defense services),".

(6) Amend redesignated subsection (f) as follows:

(A) Strike out "part I" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(B) Strike out "section 637(a)" and substitute "section 535(a)".

(j) Redesignate section 633, which relates to waivers of certain laws, as section 531 and repeal subsection (b) of said section and redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(k) Redesignate section 634, which relates to reports and information, as section 532 and amend subsection (d) of said section by striking out "section 303, 610, 614(a) or 614(b)" and substituting "section 303, 510, 514(a) or 514(b)".

(l) Redesignate section 635, which relates to general authorities, as section 533 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (h) to read as follows: "(h) A contract or agreement which entails commitments for the expenditure of funds available under titles II and V of chapter 2 and available under title VI of said chapter, to the extent such contract or agreement relates to funds not required to be made available on a dollar repayable loan basis, may, subject to any future action of the Congress, extend at any time for not more than five years."

(2) In subsection (k), strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(3) Add the following new subsection (l):

"(l) The President, when he finds it to be in the interest of the United States, is authorized to sell buildings and grounds in foreign countries acquired in connection with carrying out activities under this Act, and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the proceeds of such sale may be applied toward the purchase and construction, furnishing, improvement, and preservation of other properties or held for such later use: *Provided, however,* That the President shall report all such transactions annually to the Congress with the budget estimates of the agency primarily responsible for administering this Act."

(m) Redesignate section 636, which relates to provisions on uses of funds, as section 534 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) Strike out "part I" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(B) In the introductory clause, strike out "(except for part II)".

(C) In paragraph (2), strike out "section 626" and substitute "section 524".

(D) In paragraph (5), strike out "section 631" and substitute "section 529".

(2) In subsections (c) and (d), strike out "of part I" wherever it appears.

(3) In subsection (e), strike out "of part I" and "section 625(d)(2)" and substitute for the latter "section 523(c)(2)".

(4) Amend subsection (f) as follows:

(A) Strike out "section 637(a)" and substitute "section 535(a)".

(B) Strike out "part I" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(C) Strike out "Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes" and substitute "Latin American Development Act".

(6) Subsection (g) is repealed and subsection (h) redesignated subsection (g).

(n) Redesignate section 637, which relates to administrative expenses, as section 535 and amend subsection (a) of said section by striking out "1965" and "$52,500,000" and substituting "1966" and "$55,240,000", respectively, and by striking out "part I" and substituting "this Act".

(o) Redesignate section 638, which relates to Peace Corps assistance, as section 536 and amend said section by striking out all beginning with "; or famine".

(p) Add the following new section 537:

"SEC. 537. Famine and disaster relief.—No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country for famine or disaster relief."

Title III—Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 114. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to miscellaneous provisions, is redesignated title III of chapter 7 and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 641, which relates to effective date and identification of programs, as section 541.

(b) Dedesignate section 642, which relates to statutes repealed, as section 542 and amend subsection (a)(2) of said section by striking out "143," and all beginning with "*: Provided,*".

(c) Redesignate section 643, which relates to savings provisions, as section 543 and amend said section by striking out "section 642(a)" wherever it appears and substituting "section 542(a)".

(d) Redesignate section 644, which relates to definitions, as section 544 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Subsections (b), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i), and (m) are repealed.

(2) Subsections (c), (h), (j), (k), and (l) are designated subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

(e) Redesignate sections 645, 646, 647, and 648, which relate respectively to unexpended balances, construction, dependable fuel supply and special authorization for use of foreign currencies, as sections 545, 546, 547, and 548, respectively, and amend redesignated section 545 by striking out "Public Law 86–735" and substituting "the Latin American Development Act".

MILITARY

An act to promote the foreign policy and provide for the security and general welfare of the United States by furnishing defense articles, services, and training to friendly countries and international organizations,

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965".

CHAPTER 1—OBJECTIVES AND DEFINITIONS

SEC. 1. OBJECTIVES.—It is the policy of the United States to assist friendly countries in their individual and collective self-defense efforts by making it possible for them to acquire defense articles, services, and training.

This policy is based upon the principles of effective self-help and mutual aid. It is the sense of Congress that grants of defense articles should not be made to any country having sufficient resources to enable it to maintain and equip its own military forces at adequate strength without undue burden to its economy.

The Congress recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered so long as the Soviet Union and Communist China and their allies continue by threat of military action, by use of economic pressure, and by internal subversion or other means, to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent, and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and countries once free but now subject to such domination.

It continues to be the intention of the United States to seek to achieve international peace and security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except for individual and collective self defense.

The Congress reaffirms its belief in the importance of regional organizations of free people for mutual assistance, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Organization of American States, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the Central Treaty Organization, and others, and expresses its hope that such organizations may be strengthened and broadened, and their programs of self-help and mutual cooperation may be made more effective in the protection of the independence and security of free peoples, in the development of their economic and social well-being, and the safeguarding of their basic rights and liberties. The Congress welcomes, in particular, steps which have been taken to integrate and coordinate procurement, research, development, production, and logistics support of defense articles by the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It is the sense of the Congress that an important contribution toward peace would be made by the establishment of earmarked military units under the Organization of the American States for peacekeeping missions in the Western Hemisphere. Similar units in other areas should be encouraged where appropriate.

In enacting this legislation, it is therefore the intention of Congress to promote the peace of the world and the security, foreign policy, and general welfare of the United States by fostering an improved climate of political independence and individual liberty, improving the ability of friendly countries and international organizations to deter or if necessary defeat Communist or Communist supported aggression, facilitating arrangements for individual and collective security, assisting friendly countries to maintain internal security, and creating an environment of security and stability in developing friendly countries through civic action and other programs essential to their more rapid social, economic, and political progress. The Congress urges that all other countries able to contribute join in the common undertaking to meet these goals.

SEC. 2. COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY.—(a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

(b) The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission. The Chief of the Diplomatic Mission shall make sure that recommendations of such representatives pertaining to military assistance and sales are coordinated with political and economic considerations, and his comments shall accompany such recommendations if he so desires.

(c) Under the direction of the President, the Secretary of State shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and general direction of the programs authorized by this Act, including but not limited to determining whether there shall be a military assistance or sales program for a country and the value thereof, to the end that such programs are effectively integrated both at home and abroad with programs of economic assistance and the foreign policy of the United States is best served thereby.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.—As used in this Act—

(a) "Armed Forces" of the United States means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

(b) "Defense article" includes any—

(1) weapon, weapons system, munition, aircraft, vessel, boat, or other implement of war;

(2) property, installation, commodity, material, equipment, supply, or goods used for the purposes of this Act;

(3) machinery, facility, tool, material, supply, or other item necessary for the manufacture, production, processing, repair, servicing, storage, construction, transportation, operation, or use of any article listed in this subsection; and

(4) component or part of any article listed in this subsection; but shall not include merchant vessels or, as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), source material, by-product material, special nuclear material, or atomic weapons.

(c) "Defense information" includes any document, writing, sketch, photograph, plan, model, specification, design, prototype, drawing, technical manual, publication, or other recorded or oral information relating to any defense article or defense service, but shall not include restricted data as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and data removed from the restricted data category under section 142(d) of that Act.

(d) "Defense service" includes packing, crating, handling, transportation, and any service, test, inspection, repair, rehabilitation, technical assistance, or defense information used for the purposes of this Act.

(e) "Excess defense articles" means the quantity of defense articles owned by the United States Government and not procured in anticipation of military assistance or sales requirements, or pursuant to a military assistance or sales order, which is in excess of the mobilization reserve at this time such articles are dropped from inventory by the supplying agency for delivery to countries or international organizations under this Act.

(f) "Mobilization reserve" means the quantity of defense articles determined to be required, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, to support mobilization of the Armed Forces of the United States Government in the event of war or national emergency.

(g) "Officer or employee" means civilian personnel and members of the Armed Forces of the United States Government.

(h) "Training" includes—

(1) formal or informal instruction of foreign students in the United States or overseas by officers or employees of the United States, contract technicians, contractors (including instruction at civilian institutions), or by correspondence courses and technical, educational, or informational publications and media of all kinds;

(2) orientation;

(3) training exercise;

(4) defense information;

(5) training aid;

(6) military advice to foreign military units and forces; and

(7) the transfer of limited quantities of defense articles for test, evaluation, or standardization purposes.

(i) "Value" means—

(1) with respect to excess defense articles, the gross cost incurred by the United States in repairing, rehabilitating, or modifying such articles;

(2) with respect to nonexcess defense articles delivered from inventory to countries or international organizations under this Act, the standard price in effect at the time such articles are dropped from inventory by the supplying agency. Such standard price shall be the same price (including authorized reduced prices) used for transfers or sales of such articles in or between the Armed Forces of the United States Government, or, where such articles are not transferred or sold in or between the Armed Forces of the United States, the gross cost to the United States Government adjusted as appropriate for condition and market value; and

(3) with respect to nonexcess defense articles delivered from new procurement to countries or international organizations under this Act, the contract or production costs of such articles.

(j) "United States Government Agency" includes any agency, department, board, wholly or partly owned corporation, instrumentality, commission, or establishment of the United States Government.

CHAPTER 2—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Title I—Grants of defense articles and defense services for individual and collective security

SEC. 11. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President may acquire from any source and make grants of defense articles and defense services, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including loans) to any friendly country or international organization, the assisting of which the President finds will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace.

SEC. 12. PURPOSES OF GRANTS.—(a) Grants of defense articles and defense services under this title to any country may be made solely for internal security, for legitimate self-defense, to permit the recipient country to participate in regional or collective arrangements or measures consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, or otherwise to permit the recipient country to participate in collective measures requested by the United Nations for the purpose of maintaining or restoring international peace and security.

(b) To the extent feasible and consistent with the purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the use of defense articles and defense services granted under this title for such purposes by the recipient country for civic action activities authorized by title II of this chapter shall be encouraged.

SEC. 13. GENERAL CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY.—(a) In addition to such other provisions as the President may require, no defense articles shall be granted under this title to any country unless it shall have agreed that:

(1) it will not, without the consent of the President—

(A) permit any use of such articles by anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of that country,

(B) transfer, or permit any officer, employee, or agent of that country to transfer such articles by gift, sale, or otherwise, or

(C) use or permit the use of such articles for purposes other than those for which furnished;

(2) it will maintain the security of such articles, and will provide substantially the same degree of security protection afforded such articles by the United States Government;

(3) it will, as the President may require, permit continuous observation and review by, and furnish necessary information to, representatives of the United State Government with regard to the use of such articles; and

(4) unless the President consents to other disposition, it will return to the United States Government for such use or disposition as the President considers in the best interest of the United States, such articles which are no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished.

(b) No defense articles shall be granted under this title to any country of a value in excess of $3,000,000 in any fiscal year unless the President determines—

(1) That such country conforms to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations;

(2) that such defense articles will be utilized by such country for the maintenance of its own defensive strength, and the defensive strength of the free world; and

(3) that such country is taking all reasonable measures, consistent with its political and economic stability, which may be needed to develop its defense capacities.

Title II—Civic action assistance

SEC. 21. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President may acquire from any source and make grants of defense articles and defense services, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including loans), to any developing friendly country otherwise eligible under sections 11 and 13, for the purpose of assisting the military forces of that country (or the voluntary efforts of personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States) to construct public works and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic and social development of that country. It is the sense of the Congress that, insofar as practicable, such foreign military forces should not be maintained or established solely for civic action activities and that such civic action activities not significantly detract from the capability of the military forces to perform their military missions and be coordinated with and form part of the total economic and social development effort.

Title III—Training and detail of personnel

SEC. 31. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may furnish training, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, to any friendly country or international organization, eligibile under section 11.

(b) Members of the Armed Forces of the United States and other personnel of the Department of Defense may be assigned or detailed under this Act only to perform duties of a non-combatant nature.

SEC. 32. DETAIL OF PERSONNEL TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, any officer or employee of the Department of Defense may be detailed or assigned—

(1) to any office or position with any foreign government or governmental agency, where acceptance of such office or position does not involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government on the acceptance of compensation or other benefits from such foreign country by such officer or employee; or

(2) to any international organization to serve with, or as a member of, the international staff of such international organization, or to render any technical, scientific, or professional advice or services to, or in cooperation with, such organization.

SEC. 33. STATUS OF PERSONNEL ASSIGNED OR DETAILED.—(a) Any officer or employee, while assigned or detailed under section 32 of this Act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his allowances, privileges, rights, seniority, and other benefits as such, an officer or employee of the United States Government and of the activity of the Department of Defense from which detailed or assigned, and he shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from funds appropriated for that activity.

(b) Any officer or employee assigned, detailed, or appointed under section 32 of this Act may receive under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1131). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all of the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 70).

SEC. 34. TERMS OF DETAIL OR ASSIGNMENT.—Details or assignment may be made under section 32 of this Act—

(1) without reimbursement to the United States Government by the foreign government or international organization;

(2) upon agreement by the foreign government or international organization, to reimburse the United States Government for compensation, travel expenses, allowances, and benefits, or any part thereof, payable to the officer or employee concerned during the period of assignment or detail; and such reimbursements (including foreign currencies) shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized for paying such compensation, travel expenses, allowances, or benefits, or to the appropriation fund, or account currently available for such purposes;

(3) upon an advance of funds, property, or services by the foreign government or international organization to the United States Government accepted with the approval of the President for specified uses in furtherance of the purposes of this Act; and funds so advanced may be established as a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States Government, to be available for the specified uses, and to be used for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure subject to the provisions of this Act, any unexpended balance of such account to be returned to the foreign government or international organization; or

(4) subject to the receipt by the United States Government of a credit to be applied against the payment by the United States Government of its share of the expenses of the international organization to which the officer or employee is detailed or assigned, such credit to be based upon the compensation, travel expenses, allowances, and benefits, or any part thereof, payable to such officer or employee during the period of detail or assignment in accordance with section 32 of this Act.

Title IV—Collective defense activities

SEC. 41. INFRASTRUCTURE AND JOINT USE FACILITIES.—The President may enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements with any friendly foreign country or international organization eligible under sections 11 and 13, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including financial contributions of funds made available under this Act) for the acquisition or construction of facilities for collective defense or which are to be jointly utilized by the Armed Forces of the United States and friendly foreign military forces or which may be utilized by the Armed Forces of the United States upon the implementation of contingency plans of the United States.

SEC. 42. INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS.—The President may use funds made available under this Act to enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for sharing the costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining international military headquarters and organizations in which the Department of Defense participates.

Title V—Restrictions on assistance

SEC. 51. SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY.—(a) (1) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any economically developed nation capable of sustaining its own defense burden and economic growth, except (1) to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963, or (2) additional orientation and training expenses under this chapter during each fiscal year in an amount not to exceed $500,000.

(2) The President shall regularly reduce and, with such deliberate speed as orderly procedure and other relevant considerations, including prior commitments, will permit, shall terminate all further grants of defense articles to any country having sufficient resources to enable it, in the judgment of the President, to maintain and equip its own military forces at adequate strength, without undue burden to its economy.

(b) Any country which hereafter uses defense articles or defense services furnished such country under this Act or any predecessor foreign assistance Act, in substantial violation of the provisions of this Act or any agreement entered into pursuant to any of such Acts shall be immediately ineligible for further assistance.

(c) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any country which furnishes assistance to the present Government of Cuba unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

(d) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act shall be used to furnish assistance under this chapter to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

(i) any items of economic assistance.

(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime; and

(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

(e) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter to the government of any country which is indebted to any United States citizen or person for goods or services furnished to or ordered where (i) such citizen or person has exhausted available legal remedies, which shall include arbitration, or (ii) the debt is not denied or contested by such government, or (iii) such indebtedness arises under an unconditional guaranty of payment given by such government, or any predecessor government, directly or indirectly, through any controlled entity: *Provided,* That the President does not find such action contrary to the national security.

(f) The President shall suspend assistance under this chapter to the government of any country when the government of such country or any government agency or subdivision

within such country on or after January 1, 1962—

(A) has nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

(B) has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

(C) has imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned,

and such country, government agency, or government subdivision fails within a reasonable time (not more than six months after such action, or, in the event of a referral to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States within such period as provided herein, not more than twenty days after the report of the Commission is received) to take appropriate steps, which may include arbitration, to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange, equivalent to the full value thereof, as required by international law, or fails to take steps designed to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, or conditions, as the case may be; and such suspension shall continue until the President is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken, and no other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

Upon request of the President (within seventy days after such action referred to in subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1) of this subsection), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States (established pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1954, 68 Stat. 1279) is hereby authorized to evaluate expropriated property, determining the full value of any property nationalized, expropriated, or seized, or subject to discriminatory or other actions as aforesaid, for purposes of this subsection and to render an advisory report to the President within ninety days after such request. Unless authorized by the President, the Commission shall not publish its advisory report except to the citizen or entity owning such property. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amount, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Commission to carry out expeditiously its functions under this subsection.

(g) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

(1) the United States,

(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954,

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

(h) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter after December 31, 1965, to the government of any less developed country which has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221(b)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b)(1).

SEC. 52. COUNTRIES SPECIFICALLY INELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.—(a) Except as may be deemed by the President in the interest of the United States, no assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any government of Cuba, until the President determines that such government has taken appropriate steps according to international law standards to return to United States citizens, and to entities not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or to provide equitable compensation to such citizens and entities for property taken from such citizens and entities on or after January 1, 1959, by the Government of Cuba.

(b) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any Communist country. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act unless the President finds and promptly reports to Congress that: (1) such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international communism. For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase "Communist country" shall include specifically, but not be limited to, the following countries:

Peoples Republic of Albania,
Peoples Republic of Bulgaria,
Peoples Republic of China,
Czechoslovak Socialist Republic,
German Democratic Republic (East Germany),
Estonia,
Hungarian Peoples Republic,
Latvia,
Lithuania,
North Korean Peoples Republic,
North Vietnam,
Outer Mongolia-Mongolian Peoples Republic,
Polish Peoples Republic,
Rumanian Peoples Republic,
Tibet,
Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia,
Cuba, and
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (including its captive constituent republics).

(c) No assistance under this chapter shall be furnished to Indonesia unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States. The President shall keep the Congress fully and currently informed of any assistance furnished to Indonesia under this chapter.

SEC. 53. REGIONAL RESTRICTIONS.—(a) The value of defense articles granted to American Republics (including defense articles granted in implementing a feasible plan for regional defense) under this chapter in each fiscal year shall not exceed $55,000,000. Except for civic action assistance, defense articles shall be granted under this chapter to any American Republic only to the extent that the President determines that such defense articles are necessary to safeguard the security of the United States, or to safeguard the security of a country associated with the United States in the Alliance for Progress against overthrow of a duly constituted government.

(b) The value of defense articles granted under this chapter to African countries in each fiscal year shall not exceed $25,000,000. No defense articles shall be granted under this chapter to any country in Africa except for internal security requirements or for civic action assistance unless the President determines otherwise.

(c) Determinations under this section shall be promptly reported to the Congress.

SEC. 54. CERTIFICATION OF RECIPIENT'S CAPABILITY.—(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no defense article having a value in excess of $100,000 shall hereafter be delivered to any country or international organization under the authority of this chapter unless the chief of the appropriate military assistance advisory group representing the United States with respect to defense articles used by such country or international organization, or the head of any other group representing the United States with respect to defense articles used by such country or international organization, has certified in writing within six months prior to delivery that the country or international organization has the capability to utilize effectively such article in carrying out the purposes of this chapter.

(b) Defense articles included in approved military assistance programs may be delivered to any country or international organization for which the certification required by subsection (a) of this section cannot be made when determined necessary and specifically approved in advance by the Secretary of State (or, upon appropriate delegation of authority by an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary of State) and the Secretary of Defense (or, upon appropriate delegation of authority by the Deputy Secretary or an Assistant Secretary of Defense). The Secretary of State, or his delegate, shall make a complete report to the Congress of each determination and approval and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 55. COMMINGLING OF ASSISTANCE.—The President shall adopt regulations and establish procedures to insure that assistance under this chapter is not used in a manner which, contrary to the best interests of the United States, promotes or assists the foreign aid projects or activities of the Communist-bloc countries.

CHAPTER 3—SALES, BARTER TRANSACTIONS AND LEASES

SEC. 70. OBJECTIVES.—The aim of this chapter is to advance the overall objectives of this Act set forth in section 1 by facilitating the acquisition on a reimbursable basis of defense articles, defense services, and training by friendly countries having sufficient wealth to maintain and equip their own military forces wholly or in part without grant assistance. The Congress urges that, consistent with section 1, treaties and other international obligations, emphasis be given to transactions authorized by this chapter in order to promote the defensive strength of the free world. The Congress further declares that, in the administration of this chapter, participation by private enterprise should be encouraged to the maximum extent practical.

Title I—Cash sales

SEC. 71. SALES FROM STOCK.—(a) The President may sell for United States dollars defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense and defense services and training to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 11, without reimbursement from funds available for use under this Act, on terms of payment of not less than the value thereof in advance or within 120 days after the delivery of the defense articles or the provision of the defense services or training. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3(1)(2), nonexcess defense articles may be sold under this subsection at the standard price in effect at the time such articles are offered for sale to the purchasing country or international organization. For the purpose of this subsection, the value of excess defense articles shall not be less than—

(1) the value specified in section 3(i)(1) plus the scrap value, or

(2) the market value, if ascertainable, whichever is greater.

(b) Payments received under subsection (a) of this section shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account funding the cost of the defense articles, defense services, or training sold, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

SEC. 72. PROCUREMENT FOR SALE.—(a) The President may, without requirement for any charge to any appropriation or contract authorization otherwise provided, enter into contracts for the procurement of defense articles, defense services, and training for sale for United States dollars to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 11 if such country or international organization—

(1) provides the United States Government with a dependable undertaking which will assure the United States Government against any loss on the contracts, and

(2) agrees to make funds available in such amounts and at such times as may be required to meet the payments required by the contracts, and any damages and costs that may accrue from the cancellation of such contracts, in advance of the time such payments, damages, or costs are due: *Provided*, That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, accept a dependable undertaking to make full payment within 120 days after delivery of the defense articles, or the provision of the defense services or training, and appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used to meet the payments required by the contracts and shall be reimbursed by the amounts subsequently received from the country or international organization: *Provided further*, That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, enter into sales agreements with purchasing countries or international organizations which fix the prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations for the defense articles, defense services, or training ordered. Funds available under this Act for financing credit sales shall be used to reimburse the applicable appropriations in the amounts required by the contracts which exceed the price so fixed, except that such reimbursement shall not be required upon determination by the President that the continued production of the defense article being sold is advantageous to the Armed Forces of the United States. Payments by purchasing countries of international organizations which exceed the amounts required by such contracts shall be credited to the account established under section 83.

(b) No sales of unclassified defense articles shall be made to the government of any economically developed country under the provisions of this section unless such articles are not generally available for purchase by such countries from commercial sources in the United States. The Secretary of Defense may waive the provisions of this subsection when he determines that the waiver of such provisions is in the national interest.

Title II—Credit sales and guarantees

SEC. 81. GENERAL AUTHORITY FOR CREDIT SALES.—(a) The President may use funds available under this Act to finance credit sales of defense articles, defense services, and training to friendly foreign countries and international organizations eligible under section 11 on such terms as he may determine, including the prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations. Reimbursement to supplying agencies shall be governed by section 122.

(b) In addition, when the President determines it to be in the national interest, sales under section 71 may be made on terms of payment of not more than three years after the delivery of the defense article or the provision of the defense service or training.

SEC. 82. GUARANTEES.—(a) The President may guarantee, insure, coinsure, and reinsure any individual, corporation, partnership, or other association doing business in the United States against political and credit risks of nonpayment arising in connection with sales financed by such individual, corporation, partnership or other association of defense articles, defense services, and training procured in the United States by friendly countries and international organizations eligible under section 11.

(b) In issuing guarantees, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance, the President may enter into contracts with exporters, insurance companies, financial institutions, or others, or groups thereof, and where appropriate may employ any of the same to act as agent in the issuance and servicing of such guarantees, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance, and the adjustment of claims arising thereunder.

(c) Fees and premiums shall be charged in connection with such contracts of guaranty insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance (excluding contracts with United States Government Agencies), and such fees and premiums may be utilized to meet liabilities resulting from such contracts.

(d) Obligations shall be recorded against the funds available for credit sales in an amount not less than 25 per centum of the contractual liability related to any guarantee, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance issued pursuant to this section, and the funds so obligated, together with fees and premiums, shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims under such contracts. Any guarantees, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance issued pursuant to this section shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

SEC. 83. REIMBURSEMENTS.—(a) Whenever funds available under this Act are used to finance credit sales, repayments in United States dollars (including dollar proceeds derived from the sale of foreign currency repayments), receipts received from the disposition of evidences of indebtedness, and charges (including fees and premiums) or interest collected shall be credited to a separate fund account, and shall be available until expended solely for the purpose of financing further credit sales, including the overhead costs thereof.

(b) All assets and obligations of the military sales credit account administratively established on the books of the Treasury pursuant to section 508 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, including proceeds receivable from previous credit sales transactions, and such amounts of the appropriations authorized under this Act as may be determined by the President shall be transferred or credited to the separate fund account established under section 83(a) and shall be available until expended solely for the purpose of financing credit sales, including the overhead costs thereof.

SEC. 84. FOREIGN CURRENCIES.—Sales financed under this title may provide for payment in foreign currencies only to the extent that the Secretary of the Treasury determines at the time of each such sale that the existing or anticipated requirements for such foreign currencies for payment of United States obligations abroad are such that an excess of United States Government holdings of any particular foreign currency is not likely to result.

SEC. 85. COLLECTIONS.—In carrying out this title, the President—

(1) may acquire and dispose of, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine, any evidence of indebtedness; and

(2) may collect or compromise any indebtedness owed to the Department of Defense by foreign countries or international organizations.

Title III—Barter transactions

SEC. 91. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may, without reimbursement from funds available for use under this Act, barter defense articles which are in the stocks of the Department of Defense or which the Department of Defense is authorized to procure under other provisions of law, defense services, and training with any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 11 in exchange for other defense articles, defense services, and training of approximately equal or equivalent value for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) The President may, subject to the provisions of section 122, also use funds available to carry out this Act to acquire defense articles, defense services, and training from any source and barter such defense articles, defense services, or training with any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 11 in exchange for other defense articles, defense services, or training.

SEC. 92. DISPOSITION OF DEFENSE ARTICLES, DEFENSE SERVICES, AND TRAINING RECEIVED IN EXCHANGE UNDER SECTION 91(b).—Defense articles, defense services, and training received by the United States Government from a country or international organization in exchange for defense articles, defense services, and training bartered by the United States Government under section 91(b) may be used to carry out this Act, may be sold (on cash or credit terms, including payment in foreign currencies) to any friendly country or international organization, or may be transferred to any United States Government agency for stockpiling or other purposes. If such disposal or transfer is made subject to reimbursement, the funds so received shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account which funded the cost of the defense articles, defense services, or training bartered to the country or international organization, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purposes.

Title IV—Leases

SEC. 101. LEASES.—(a) The President may, subject to section 122, use funds available to carry out this Act to acquire defense articles from any source and lease such defense articles, on such terms and conditions of payment as he may determine, to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 11.

(b) Payments received under this section shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account funding the cost of the defense articles leased, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

Title V—General provisions

SEC. 111. PURPOSES.—Defense articles, defense services, and training may be sold, bartered, or leased under this chapter to eligible countries solely for the purposes specified in sections 12 and 21.

CHAPTER 4—FISCAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 121. ALLOCATIONS.—The President may allocate to any United States Government agency any part of any funds available for carrying out the purposes of this Act, including any advance to the United States Government by any country or international organization, for the procurement of defense articles, defense services, and training. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure for the purposes for which authorized, in accordance with authority granted in this Act or under authority governing the activities of the United States Government agencies to which such funds are allocated.

SEC. 122. REIMBURSEMENTS.—(a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, reimbursement shall be made to any activity of the Department of Defense and to any other United States Government agency, from

funds available for use under this Act for defense articles, defense services, and training furnished to foreign countries and international organizations by, or through, such activity or agency under this Act. Such reimbursement shall be in an amount equal to the value as defined in section 3 of the defense articles, defense services, and training furnished, plus expenses arising from or incident to operations under this Act (other than pay and allowances of members of the Armed Forces). The amount of such reimbursement shall be credited to the current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts of such activity.

(b) Orders to a supplying agency under this Act shall be based upon the best estimates of stock status and prevailing prices; reimbursements to the supplying agency shall be made on the basis of the stock status and prices determined pursuant to section 3(1). Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Secretary of Defense may prescribe regulations authorizing reimbursements to the supplying agency based on negotiated prices for aircraft, vessels, plant equipment, and such other major items as he may specify: *Provided,* That such articles are not excess at the time such prices are negotiated: *Provided further,* That such prices are negotiated at the time firm orders are placed with the supplying agency.

SEC. 123. APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act not to exceed $1,170,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1966, which shall remain available until expended. In addition, there is hereby authorized to be authorized to the President for use in Vietnam such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs, if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided,* That the President shall present to each committee of the Congress charged with considering legislation under this Act, the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence, such presentation to be in the manner and to the extent determined by said committee.

SEC. 124. SPECIAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may, if he determines it to be vital to the security of the United States, order defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense and defense services and training for the purpose of this Act without reimbursement therefor from appropriations available for military assistance. The value of such orders shall not exceed $300,000,000 during each fiscal year. Prompt notice of action taken under this subsection shall be given to the Congress.

(b) The Department of Defense is authorized to incur, in applicable appropriations, obligations in amounts equivalent to such orders under subsection (a) of this section. Appropriations of such sums as may be necessary to liquidate the obligations so incurred are hereby authorized.

SEC. 125. LETTERS OF COMMITMENT.—In carrying out this Act accounts may be established on the books of the Department of Defense (1) against which letter of commitment may be issued which shall constitute recordable obligations of the United States Government and moneys due or to become due under such letters of commitment shall be assignable under the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended (second and third paragraphs of 31 U.S.C. 203 and 41 U.S.C. 15), and (2) from which disbursements may be made to recipient countries or agencies, organizations, or persons upon presentation of contracts, invoices, or other appropriate documentation. Expenditures of funds which have been made available through accounts so established shall be accounted for on standard documentation required for expenditure of funds of the United States Government: *Provided,* That such expenditures for defense articles, defense services, and training procured outside the United States shall be accounted for exclusively on such certification as may be prescribed in regulations approved by the Comptroller General of the United States.

CHAPTER 5—GENERAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Title I—General Provisions

SEC. 131. GENERAL AUTHORITIES.—(a) The President may make and perform agreements and contracts with, or enter into other transactions with, any individual, corporation, or other body of persons, or Government agency, whether within or without the United States, and international organization in furtherance of the purposes, and within the limitations, of this Act.

(b) A contract under this Act may, subject to future action of the Congress, extend at any time for not more than five (5) years.

(c) The President may accept and use in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, money, funds, property, and services of any kind made available by gift, devise, bequest, grant, or otherwise for such purposes.

(d) Any officer of the United States Government carrying out functions under this Act may utilize the services and facilities of or procure defense articles from, any United States Government agency with the consent of the head of such agency, or as the President shall direct, and funds allocated pursuant to this subsection to any such agency may be established in separate transfer appropriation accounts on the books of the Treasury.

SEC. 132. WAIVER AUTHORITIES.—(a) The President may authorize in each fiscal year the use of funds made available for use under this Act and the furnishing of assistance under section 124 in a total amount not to exceed $125,000,000, without regard to the provisions of this Act, any Act appropriating funds for use under this Act, or the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, in furtherance of any of the purposes of such Acts, when he determines that such authorization is important to the security of the United States. Not more than $50,000,000 of the funds available under this subsection may be allocated to any one country in any fiscal year. Each determination shall be reported promptly to the Congress.

(b) Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the functions authorized under this Act may be performed without regard to such provisions of law (other than the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1211 et seq.)) regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts and the expenditure of funds of the United States Government as the President may specify.

(c) The President is authorized to use amounts not to exceed $25,000,000 of the funds available for use under this Act pursuant to his certification that it is inadvisable to specify the nature of the use of such funds, which certification shall be deemed to be a sufficient voucher for such amounts.

(d) The functions authorized under this Act may be performed without regard to such provisions as the President may specify of the joint resolution of November 4, 1939 (54 Stat. 4), as amended.

(e) The provisions of section 955 of title 18 of the United States Code shall not apply to prevent any person, including any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, from acting for, or participating in, any operation or transaction arising under this part or from acquiring new obligations issued in connection with any operation or transaction arising under this Act.

SEC. 133. RETENTION AND USE OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—(a) Any defense articles procured to carry out this Act may be retained by, or transferred to, and for the use of, such United States Government agency as the President may determine in lieu of being disposed of to a foreign country or international organization, whenever in the judgment of the President the best interests of the United States will be served thereby. Any defense articles so retained may be disposed of without regard to provisions of law relating to the disposal of property owned by the United States Government, when necessary to prevent spoilage or wastage of such defense articles or to conserve the usefulness thereof. Funds realized from any transfer or disposal shall revert to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

(b) Funds realized by the United States Government from the sale, transfer, or disposal of defense articles returned to the United States Government by a recipient country or international organization as no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished shall be credited to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

SEC. 134. ORDERLY TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Funds made available under this Act shall remain available for a period not to exceed twelve months from the date of termination of assistance or related activities to or with a foreign country or international organization for the necessary expenses of winding up programs related thereto.

SEC. 135. PATENTS AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION.—(a) Whenever, in connection with the performance of functions under this Act—

(1) an invention or discovery covered by a patent issued by the United States Government is practiced within the United States without the authorization of the owner, or

(2) information, which is (A) protected by law, and (B) held by the United States Government subject to restrictions imposed by the owner, is disclosed by the United States Government or any of its officers, employees, or agents in violation of such restrictions,

the exclusive remedy of the owner, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, is to sue the United States Government for reasonable and entire compensation for such practice or disclosure in the district court of the United States for the district in which such owner is a resident, or in the Court of Claims, within six years after the cause of action arises. Any period during which the United States Government is in possession of a written claim under section (b) of this section before mailing a notice of denial of that claim does not count in computing the six years. In any such suit, the United States Government may plead any defense that may be pleaded by a private person in such an action. A Government employee shall have the right to bring suit against the Government under this section except where he was in a position to order, influence, or induce use of the invention by the Government. This section shall not confer a right of action on any patentee or any assignee of such patentee with respect to any invention discovered or invented by a person while in the employment or service of the United States, where the invention was related to the official functions of the employee, in cases in which such functions included research and development, or in the making of which

Government time, materials or facilities were used.

(b) Before suit against the United States Government has been instituted, the head of the agency of the United States Government concerned may settle and pay any claim arising under the circumstances described in subsection (a) of this section. No claim may be paid under this subsection unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

SEC. 136. SHIPPING ON UNITED STATES VESSELS.—The ocean transportation between foreign countries of defense articles purchased with foreign currencies made available or derived from funds available under this Act or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), shall not be governed by the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), or any other law relating to the ocean transportation of defense articles on United States vessels.

SEC. 137. PROCUREMENT OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Funds available under this Act may be used for procurement of defense articles outside the United States only if the President determines that such procurement will not result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States or the industrial mobilization base, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus or to the net position of the United States in its balance of payments with the rest of the world, which outweigh the economic or other advantages to the United States of less costly procurement outside the United States.

Title II—Administrative provisions

SEC. 141. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise any functions conferred upon him by this Act through such agency or officer of the United States Government as he shall direct. The head of any such agency or such officer may from time to time promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out such functions, and may delegate authority to perform any such functions, including if he shall so specify, the authority successively to redelegate any of such functions to any of his subordinates.

SEC. 142. THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—(a) With respect to programs authorized by this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall have primary responsibility for—

(1) the determination of military end-item requirements;

(2) the procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs;

(3) the supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries;

(4) the supervision of the training of foreign military personnel;

(5) the movement and delivery of military end-items; and

(6) within the Department of Defense, the performance of any other functions with respect to programs authorized by this Act.

(b) The establishment of priorities in the procurement, delivery, and allocation of military equipment shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 143. MISSIONS AND STAFFS ABROAD.—The President may maintain special missions or staffs outside the United States in such countries and for such periods of time as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 144. EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL.—(a) For the purposes of performing functions under this Act outside the United States the President may employ or assign persons compensated at any of the rates provided for the Foreign Service Reserve and Staff by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), together with allowances and benefits thereunder. Persons so employed or assigned shall be entitled, except to the extent that the President may specify otherwise in cases in which the period of employment or assignment exceeds thirty months, to the same benefits as are provided by section 528 of that Act for persons appointed to the Foreign Service Reserve, and the provisions of section 1005 of that Act shall apply in the case of such persons, except that policymaking officials shall not be subject to that part of section 1005 of that Act which prohibits political tests.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 3544(b) and 8544(b) of title 10 of the United States Code, personnel of the Department of Defense may be assigned or detailed to any civil office to carry out this Act.

SEC. 145. EXPENSES.—(a) Funds made available for the purpose of this Act shall be available for—

(1) administrative and operating expenses;

(2) extraordinary expenses of not to exceed $300,000 in any fiscal year; and

(3) constructing or otherwise acquiring outside the United States essential living quarters, office space, and necessary supporting facilities for use of personnel carrying out activities authorized by this Act.

(b) Actual expenses incurred by military officers detailed or assigned as tour directors in connection with orientation visits of foreign military personnel may be reimbursed in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 836), applicable to civilian officers and employees.

SEC. 146. REPORTS AND INFORMATION.—(a) The President shall, while funds made available for the purpose of this Act remain available for obligation, transmit to the Congress after the close of each fiscal year a report concerning operations in that fiscal year under this Act.

(b) The President shall, in the reports required by subsection (a) of this section, and in response to requests from Members of the Congress or inquiries from the public, make public all information concerning operations under this Act not deemed by him to be incompatible with the security of the United States.

(c) None of the funds made available pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be used to carry out any provision of this Act in any country or with respect to any project or activity, after the expiration of the thirty-five-day period which begins on the date the General Accounting Office or any committee of the Congress charged with considering legislation, appropriations or expenditures under this Act, has delivered to the office of the head of any agency carrying out such provision, a written request that it be furnished any document, paper, communication, audit, review, finding, recommendation, report, or other material in its custody or control relating to the administration of such provision in such country or with respect to such project or activity, unless and until there has been furnished to the General Accounting Office, or to such committee, as the case may be, (1) the document paper, communication, audit, review, finding, recommendation, report, or other material so requested, or (2) a certification by the President that he has forbidden the furnishing thereof pursuant to request and his reason for so doing.

(d) At the end of each fiscal year, the President shall notify each committee of the Congress charged with considering legislation or appropriations under this Act of all actions taken during the fiscal year under this Act which resulted in furnishing assistance of a kind, for a purpose, or to an area, substantially different from that included in the presentation to the Congress during its consideration of this Act or any Act appropriating funds pursuant to authorizations contained in this Act, or which resulted in obligations or reservations greater by 50 per centum or more than the proposed obligations or reservations included in such presentation for the program concerned, and in his notification the President shall state the justification for such changes. There shall also be included in the presentation material submitted to the Congress during its consideration of amendments to this Act, or of any Act appropriating funds pursuant to authorizations contained in this Act, a comparison of the current fiscal year programs and activities with those presented to the Congress in the previous year and an explanation of any substantial changes.

Title III—Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 151. PROVISIONS OF LAW REPEALED AND AMENDED.—(a) Part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is hereby repealed.

(b) References to the statutory provisions of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, contained in other Acts shall hereafter be considered to be references to the appropriate provisions of this Act.

(c) Section 625(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated as section 147 of this Act.

SEC. 152. SAVING PROVISIONS.—(a) Except as may be expressly provided to the contrary in this Act all determinations, authorizations, regulations, orders, contracts, agreements, and other actions issued, undertaken, or entered into under authority of any provision of law repealed by this Act or Acts superseded by those provisions, shall continue in full force and effect until modified by appropriate authority.

(b) Wherever provisions of this Act establish conditions which must be complied with before use may be made of authority contained in, or funds authorized by, this Act, compliance with, or satisfaction of, substantially similar conditions under provisions of law repealed by this Act, or Acts superseded by those provisions shall be deemed to constitute compliance with the conditions established by this Act.

(c) Funds made available pursuant to provisions of law repealed by this Act shall, unless otherwise authorized or provided by law, remain available for their original purposes in accordance with the provision of law currently applicable to those purposes.

SEC. 153. UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Unexpended balances of funds made available pursuant to this Act hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated.

SEC. 154. CONSTRUCTION.—If any provisions of this Act or the application of any provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act, and of the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons, shall not be affected thereby.

EXHIBIT 2

H.R. —

A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes

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 "Foreign Assistance Act of 1965".

PART I: CHAPTER 1—POLICY

SEC. 101. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the statement of policy, is amended by inserting after the second full sentence in the thirteenth paragraph thereof the following: "Congress further urges that the United States and other free world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis and that the

United States continue its efforts to improve coordination among programs of assistance carried out on a bilateral basis by free world nations".

CHAPTER 2—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Title II—Technical cooperation and development grants

SEC. 102. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 212, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$215,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$210,000,000", respectively.

(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is hereby repealed effective July 1, 1966.

(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out "1965, $18,000,000" and substituting "1966, $7,000,000".

Title III—Investment guaranties

SEC. 103. Title III of chapter 2 of part 1 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend the introductory clause to read as follows: "The President may issue guaranties to eligible United States investors—".

(2) In paragraph (1), strike out "$2,500,000,000" and substitute "$5,000,000,000".

(3) Amend paragraph (2) as follows:

(A) In the first proviso, strike out ", and no such guaranty in the case of a loan shall exceed $25,000,000 and no other such guaranty shall exceed $10,000,000".

(B) In the fourth proviso, strike out "1966" and substitute "1967".

(b) Amend section 221(c), which relates to general authority, by inserting after the word "guaranty" the third time it appears, the words "of an equity investment".

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by inserting after "(exclusive of informational media guaranties)," the words "and to pay the costs of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties,".

(d) Amend section 223, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and" at the end thereof and in subsection (b) strike out the period and substitute "; and".

(2) And the following new subsection (c):

"(c) the term 'eligible United States investors' means United States citizens, or corporations, partnerships, or other associations created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens, as well as foreign corporations, partnerships, or other associations wholly owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships, or other associations: *Provided*, That the eligibility of a foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the United States owners."

(e) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, to read as follows:

"SEC. 224. HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES.—(a) It is the sense of Congress that in order to stimulate private home ownership and assist in the development of stable economies in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects, the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible United States investors as defined in section 223 assuring against loss of loan investments made by such investors in—

"(1) pilot or demonstration private housing projects in Latin America of types similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration and suitable for conditions in Latin America;

"(2) credit institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, such as savings and loan institutions;

"(3) housing projects in Latin America for lower income families and persons, which projects shall be constructed in accordance with maximum unit costs established by the President for families and persons whose incomes meet the limitations prescribed by the President;

"(4) housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and cooperatives; or

"(5) housing projects in Latin America 25 per centum or more of the aggregate of the mortgage financing for which is made available from sources within Latin America and is not derived from sources outside Latin America, which projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, have a unit cost of not more than $6,500.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $350,000,000: *Provided*, That the total face amount of guaranties issued under subsection (b)(1) outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $250,000,000: *Provided further*, That no payment may be made under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible: *Provided further*, That this authority shall continue until June 30, 1967."

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

SEC. 106. Section 252 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended, by striking out, in the first sentence thereof, all after the words "until expended" and substituting the following: "*Provided*, That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section, except for not to exceed $100,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1963 and 1964 and $85,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in each such fiscal year, shall be available only for loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars."

CHAPTER 3—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 104. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend the first sentence by striking out "1965" and "$134,272,400" and substituting "1966" and "$155,455,000", respectively.

(b) Strike out the second sentence.

CHAPTER 4—SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 105. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out in the first sentence "1965" and "$405,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$369,200,000", respectively.

CHAPTER 5—CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 106. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(1) Strike out "1965" and $150,000,000" and substitute "1966" and "$50,000,000", respectively.

(2) Add the following new sentence: "In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in Vietnam such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by parts I and II of this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided*, That the President shall present to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence."

(b) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "this section" and substituting "the first sentence of subsection (a)".

PART II: CHAPTER 2—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 503(b), which relates to general authority, by striking out the words "in foreign countries".

(b) Amend section 504, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$1,055,000,000" in the first sentence and substituting "1966" and "$1,170,000,000", respectively.

(c) Amend section 505, which relates to utilization of assistance, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out the colon and add the following: ", or for the purpose of assisting foreign military forces (or the voluntary efforts of personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States) to construct public works and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic and social development of friendly countries. It is the sense of the Congress that, insofar as practicable, such foreign military forces should not be maintained or established solely for civic action activities and that such civic action activities not significantly detract from the capability of the military forces to perform their military missions and be coordinated with and form part of the total economic and social development effort."

(2) Strike out subsection (b) and redesignate the proviso of subsection (a) as subsection (b).

(3) In redesignated subsection (b), strike out "*Provided*, That except" and substitute "Except"; strike out "or (2)" and substitute ", or (2) for civic action assistance, or (3)".

(d) Amend section 507, which relates to sales, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), insert the following new sentence between the second and third sentences: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 644(m)(2), nonexcess de-

fense articles may be sold under this subsection at the standard price in effect at the time such articles are offered for sale to the purchasing country or international organization."

(2) In subsection (b), strike out the period at the end of the first proviso, substitute a colon and add the following: *"Provided further,* That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, enter into sales agreements with purchasing countries or international organizations which fix prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations for the defense articles or defense services ordered. Funds available under this part for financing sales shall be used to reimburse the applicable appropriations in the amounts required by the contracts which exceed the price so fixed, except that such reimbursement shall not be required upon determination by the President that the continued production of the defense article being sold is advantageous to the Armed Forces of the United States. Payments by purchasing countries or international organizations which exceed the amounts required by such contracts shall be credited to the account established under section 508."

(e) Amend section 508, which relates to reimbursement as follows:

(1) After "United States Government," the first time it appears insert "receipts received from the disposition of evidences of indebtedness and charges (including fees and premiums) or interest collected".

(2) Strike out "the current applicable appropriation" and substitute "a separate fund account".

(3) Strike out "furnishing further military assistance on cash or credit terms" and substitute "financing sales and guaranties, including the overhead costs thereof".

(f) Amend section 509(b), which relates to exchanges and guaranties, by inserting "(excluding contracts with any agency of the United States Government)" in the second sentence between the last word thereof and the period.

(g) Amend section 510, which relates to special authority, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "During the fiscal year 1965" and "in the fiscal year 1965" and substitute "During each fiscal year" and "in each fiscal year", respectively.

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "to the President".

(h) Amend section 512, which relates to restrictions on military aid to Africa, as follows:

(1) Strike out "programs described in section 505(b) of this chapter" and substitute "civic action requirements".

(2) Strike out "1965" and substitute "1966".

PART III: CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 605, which relates to retention and use of items, as follows:

(1) In the section heading strike out "Items" and substitute "Certain Items and Funds".

(2) Add the following new subsections:

"(c) Funds realized as a result of any failure of a transaction financed under authority of part I of this Act to conform to the requirements of this Act, or to applicable rules and regulations of the United States Government, or to the terms of any agreement or contract entered into under authority of part I of this Act, shall revert to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to finance such transaction or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

"(d) Funds realized by the United States Government from the sale, transfer, or disposal of defense articles returned to the United States Government by a recipient country or international organization as no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished shall be credited to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose."

(b) Amend section 612, which relates to use of foreign currencies, by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

CHAPTER 2—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 302. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "paragraph (3) of" and "of the officers provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection", and substitute for the latter "of one or more of said officers".

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "Public Law 86–735" wherever it appears and substitute "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(b) Amend section 625(d), which relates to the employment of personnel, as follows:

(1) In the introductory clause, strike out "outside the United States".

(2) In paragraph (2), strike out all after "prescribe" and substitute a period.

(c) Amend section 630, which relates to terms of detail or assignment, by inserting "benefits" after "travel expenses", in paragraphs (2) and (4).

(d) Amend section 635, which relates to general authorities, as follows:

(1) In subsection (g) (introductory clause), insert "and sales" after "loans".

(2) Add the following new subsection (1):

"(1) The President, when he finds it to be in the interest of the United States, is authorized to sell buildings and grounds in foreign countries acquired in connection with carrying out activities under part I of this Act, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the proceeds of such sale may be applied toward the purchase and construction, furnishing, improvement, and preservation of other properties or held for such later use: *Provided,* That the President shall report all such transactions annually to the Congress with the budget estimates of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I."

(e) Amend section 636(f), which relates to provisions on uses of funds, by striking out "Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes" and substituting "Latin American Development Act".

(f) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out "1965" and "$52,500,000" and substituting "1966" and "$55,240,000", respectively.

(g) Amend section 638, which relates to Peace Corps assistance, by striking out all beginning with "; or famine" and substituting a period.

(h) Add the following new section 639:

"SEC. 639. FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF.—No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country for famine or disaster relief."

CHAPTER 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 303. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to miscellaneous provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 642(a)(2), which relates to statutes repealed, by striking out "143," and all beginning with ": *Provided,*" up to the semicolon.

(b) Amend section 644, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (g), insert ", and not procured in anticipation of military assistance or sales requirements, or pursuant to a military assistance or sales order," after "United States Government" and strike out "as grant assistance".

(2) In subsection (m)(2), strike out "Such price shall be the same standard price" and substitute "Such standard price shall be the same price (including authorized reduced prices)".

(3) Amend the paragraph following the numbered paragraph (3) in subsection (m) as follows:

(A) In the first sentence, insert "and sales" after "Military assistance".

(B) In the second proviso, strike out "by the military assistance program".

(c) Amend section 645, which relates to unexpended balances, by striking out "Public Law 86–735" and substituting "the Latin American Development Act".

S. 1367

A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes

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 "Foreign Assistance Act of 1965".

CHAPTER 1—POLICY

SEC. 101. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the statement of policy, is amended by inserting after the second full sentence in the thirteenth paragraph thereof the following: "Congress further urges that the United States and other free world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis and that the United States continue its efforts to improve coordination among programs of assistance carried out on a bilateral basis by free world nations".

CHAPTER 2—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Title II—Technical cooperation and development grants

SEC. 102. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 212, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$215,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$210,000,000", respectively.

(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is hereby repealed effective July 1, 1966.

(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out "1965, $18,000,000" and substituting "1966, $7,000,000".

Title III—Investment guaranties

SEC. 103. Title III of chapter 2 of part 1 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend the introductory clause to read as follows:

"The President may issue guaranties to eligible United States investors—."

(2) In paragraph (1), strike out "$2,500,000,000" and substitute "$5,000,000,000."

(3) Amend paragraph (2) as follows:

(A) In the first proviso, strike out ", and no such guaranty in the case of a loan shall

exceed $25,000,000 and no other such guaranty shall exceed $10,000,000."

(B) In the fourth proviso, strike out "1966" and substitute "1967."

(b) Amend section 221(c), which relates to general authority, by inserting after the word "guaranty," the third time it appears, the words "of an equity investment."

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by inserting after "(exclusive of informational media guaranties)," the words "and to pay the costs of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties,".

(d) Amend section 223, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and" at the end thereof and in subsection (b) strike out the period and substitute "; and".

(2) Add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) the term 'eligible United States investors' means United States citizens, or corporations, partnerships, or other associations created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens, as well as foreign corporations, partnerships, or other associations wholly owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships, or other associations: *Provided,* That the eligibility of a foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the United States owners."

(e) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, to read as follows:

"SEC. 224. HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES.—(a) It is the sense of Congress that in order to stimulate private home ownership and assist in the development of stable economies in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects, the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible United States investors as defined in section 223 assuring against loss of loan investments made by such investors in—

"(1) pilot or demonstration private housing projects in Latin America of types similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration and suitable for conditions in Latin America;

"(2) credit institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, such as savings and loan institutions;

"(3) housing projects in Latin America for lower income families and persons, which projects shall be constructed in accordance with maximum unit costs established by the President for families and persons whose incomes meet the limitations prescribed by the President;

"(4) housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and cooperatives; or

"(5) housing projects in Latin America 25 per centum or more of the aggregate of the mortgage financing for which is made available from sources within Latin America and has not derived from sources outside Latin America, which projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, have a unit cost of not more than $6,500.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $350,000,000: *Provided,* That the total face amount of guaranties issued under subsection (b)(1) outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $250,000,000: *Provided further,* That no payment may be made under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible: *Provided further,* That this authority shall continue until June 30, 1967."

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

SEC. 106. Section 252 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended by striking out, in the first sentence thereof, all after the words "until expended" and substituting the following: "*Provided,* That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section, except for not to exceed $100,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1963 and 1964 and $85,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in each such fiscal year, shall be available only for loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars."

CHAPTER 3—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 104. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend the first sentence by striking out "1965" and "$134,272,400" and substituting "1966" and "$155,455,000", respectively.

(b) Strike out the second sentence.

CHAPTER 4—SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 105. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out in the first sentence "1965" and "$405,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$369,200,000", respectively.

CHAPTER 5—CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 106. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(1) Strike out "1965" and "$150,000,000" and substitute "1966" and "$50,000,000", respectively.

(2) Add the following new sentence: "In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in Vietnam such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by parts I and II of this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided,* That the President shall present to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence."

(b) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "this section" and substituting "the first sentence of subsection (a)".

PART III: CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 605, which relates to retention and use of items, as follows:

(1) In the section heading strike out "Items" and substitute "Certain Items and Funds".

(2) Add the following new subsection:

"(c) Funds realized as a result of any failure of a transaction financed under authority of part I of this Act to conform to the requirements of this Act, or to applicable rules and regulations of the United States Government, or to the terms of any agreement or contract entered into under authority of part I of this Act, shall revert to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to finance such transaction or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose."

(b) Amend section 612, which relates to use of foreign currencies, by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

CHAPTER 2—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 202. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "paragraph (3) of" and "of the officers provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection", and substitute for the latter "of one or more of said officers".

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "Public Law 86–735" wherever it appears and substitute "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(b) Amend section 625(d), which relates to the employment of personnel, as follows:

(1) In the introductory clause, strike out "outside the United States".

(2) In paragraph (2), strike out all after "prescribe" and substitute a period.

(c) Amend section 630, which relates to terms of detail or assignment, by inserting "benefits" after "travel expenses," in paragraphs (2) and (4).

(d) Amend section 635, which relates to general authorities, by adding the following new subsection (1):

"(1) The President, when he finds it to be in the interest of the United States, is authorized to sell buildings and grounds in foreign countries acquired in connection with carrying out activities under part I of this Act, and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the proceeds of such sale may be applied toward the purchase and construction, furnishing, improvement, and preservation of other properties or held for such later use: *Provided,* That the President shall report all such transactions annually to the Congress with the budget estimates of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I."

(e) Amend section 636(f), which relates to provisions on uses of funds, by striking out "Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes" and substituting "Latin American Development Act".

(f) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out "1965" and "$52,500,000" and substituting "1966" and "$55,240,000", respectively.

(g) Amend section 638, which relates to Peace Corps assistance, by striking out all beginning with "; or famine" and substituting a period.

(h) Add the following new section 639:

"SEC. 639. FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF.—No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country for famine or disaster relief."

CHAPTER 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 203. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended,

which relates to miscellaneous provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 642(a)(2), which relates to statutes repealed, by striking out "143," and all beginning with ": *Provided,*" up to the semicolon.

(b) Amend section 645, which relates to unexpended balances, by striking out "Public Law 86–735" and substituting "the Latin American Development Act".

DELEGATION REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS CONCERNING FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS UTILIZED BY THE COMMITTEE IN 1964 IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two additional delegation reports of the Committee on Foreign Relations concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by the committee in 1964 in connection with foreign travel.

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

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the American Group, 53d Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Copenhagen, Denmark, Aug. 14 to Sept. 1, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John Sparkman: Denmark	Kroner	1,242.00	180.00	956.55	138.63			422.75	61.25	2,621.30	[1] 379.88
A. Willis Robertson:											
Denmark	do	1,127.00	163.33	838.80	121.55			378.50	54.85	2,344.30	[2] 339.73
Ireland	Pound							17/10/0	49.98	17/10/0	49.98
John Stennis: Denmark	Kroner	966.00	140.00	423.90	61.42			63.00	9.13	1,992.90	210.55
Herman Talmadge:											
Denmark	do	966.00	440.00	770.40	111.64			307.10	44.50	2,043.50	296.14
Ireland	Pound			4/12/0	12.88					4/12/0	92.88
Do	U.S. dollar								10.00		10.00
Maurine Neuberger: Denmark	Kroner	966.00	140.00	447.75	64.88			722.10	104.64	2,135.85	309.52
Bourke B. Hickenlooper:											
Norway	do	230.00	32.25	233.75	32.78			30.00	4.20	493.75	69.23
Sweden	Kronor	270.00	52.63	155.20	30.25					425.20	82.88
Denmark	Kroner	2,277.00	330.00	1,523.70	220.82	20.00	2.89	211.60	30.66	4,032.30	584.37
Do	U.S. dollar				28.00				22.00		50.00
Thomas Kuchel: Denmark	Kroner	966.00	140.00	418.40	60.63			219.75	31.84	1,604.15	232.47
Gordon Allott:											
Denmark	do	1,104.00	160.00	551.80	79.96			173.75	25.17	1,829.55	265.13
Ireland	Pound			1/17/6	5.25					1/17/6	5.25
John S. Cooper: Denmark	Kroner	1,242.00	180.00	648.95	99.26			99.00	14.34	2,025.95	[3] 293.60
Wallace Bennett: Denmark	do	1,242.00	180.00	450.95	65.35			150.50	21.80	1,843.45	267.15
Strom Thurmond: Denmark	do	1,722.50	249.63	644.00	93.32			71.00	10.28	2,437.50	353.23
Milrae Jensen:											
Norway	do	202.50	28.40	14.65	2.05					17.15	30.45
Sweden	Kronor	110.00	21.44	289.05	56.34			60.00	11.69	459.05	89.47
Denmark	Kroner	1,518.00	220.00	493.1	71.47			290.75	42.13	2,301.90	[4] 333.60
Mary McFall:											
Norway	do	202.50	28.40	14.65	2.05			80.00	11.22	297.15	41.67
Sweden	Kronor	110.00	21.44	166.65	32.48			75.00	14.62	351.65	68.54
Denmark	Kroner	1,050.00	152.17	419.75	60.83			72.50	10.51	1,542.25	223.51
Darrell St. Claire: Norway	do	288.00	31.88	51.70	7.22			27.55	3.84	307.25	42.94
Delegation expenses, Norway:											
Receptions, dinners	do			3,442.50	482.70					3,442.50	482.70
Guide services	Kroner							199.00	27.81	199.00	27.81
Baggage truck	do					415.00	58.04			415.00	58.04
Chauffeur hire	do					7,560.00	1,059.34			7,560.00	1,059.34
Photographs	do							491.16	68.69	491.16	68.69
Gratuities, miscellaneous	do							1,796.89	254.03	1,796.89	[5] 254.03
Gratuities	U.S. dollars								23.60		23.60
Darrell St. Claire: Sweden	Kronor	170.00	33.13	106.05	20.67			72.00	14.03	348.05	67.83
Delegation expenses, Sweden:											
Receptions, dinners	do			1,785.05	347.96					1,785.05	347.96
Guide services	do							990.00	192.98	990.00	192.98
Baggage trucks	do					799.40	155.82			799.40	155.82
Chauffeur hire	do					1,131.84	220.63			1,131.84	220.63
Car rentals	do					3,070.00	598.44			3,070.00	598.44
Gratuities, miscellaneous	do							1,146.45	221.56	1,146.45	[5] 221.56
Gratuities, commissary	U.S. dollars								59.65		59.65
Darrell St. Claire: Denmark	Kroner	1,610.00	233.33	291.30	42.21	15.00	2.17	242.25	35.10	2,158.55	312.81
Delegation expenses, Denmark:											
Receptions, dinners	do			13,287.65	1,925.74					13,287.65	1,925.74
Airport tax	do					1,000.00	144.92			1,000.00	144.92
Hotel offices	do							5,758.45	834.55	5,758.45	834.55
Transportation	do					27,597.00	3,999.65			27,597.00	3,999.65
Gratuities	do							437.00	63.33	437.00	63.33
Miscellaneous	do							503.65	72.99	503.65	72.99
Gratuities, commissary	U.S. dollars				122.51				94.05		[5] 216.56
Communications	Kroner							910.00	131.88	910.00	131.88
Darrell St. Claire:											
Delegation expenses:											
Germany	Deutsche mark							50.00	12.59	50.00	12.59
Ireland	Pound			274/14/—	766.42	52/4/3	145.67	48/1/2	134.08	374/19/5	1,046.17
United States	U.S. dollars				1.90		10.95				12.85
Total			2,858.03		5,169.17		6,398.52		2,829.57		17,255.29

[1] $98.04 of this sum reimbursed by Senator Sparkman to the U.S. Treasury for personal expenses.

[2] $59.80 of this sum reimbursed by Senator Robertson to the U.S. Treasury for personal expenses.

[3] $90.81 of this sum reimbursed by Senator Cooper to the U.S. Treasury for personal expenses.

[4] $22.30 of this sum reimbursed by Milrae Jensen to the U.S. Treasury for personal expenses.

[5] $108.19 of these sums reimbursed by Darrell St. Claire to the U.S. Treasury for personal expenses.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$6,775.96
Appropriated funds:	
Other (22 U.S.C.A. 276)	10,478.61
Department of the Army	1,836.45
Total	19,091.02

KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Chairman, American Group.
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the American delegation to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, Kingston, Jamaica, Nov. 9–22, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John Sparkman: Jamaica	Pound							11/ 9/—	31.96	11/ 9/—	31.96
Gaylord Nelson: Jamaica	do							10/—/—	27.89	10/—/—	27.89
J. Caleb Boggs: Jamaica	do							4/ 2/—	11.47	4/—/—	11.47
Jack Miller: Jamaica	do							10/—/—	27.89	10/—/—	27.89
Norvill Jones; Jamaica	do	46/11/—	132.24	19/18/ 6	57.67			12/14/ 7	35.78	79/ 4/ 1	225.69
Octa Raby Watson: Jamaica	do	46/11/—	132.24	19/ 7/ 6	55.51			17/ 6/—	48.37	83/ 4/ 6	236.12
Darrell St. Claire; Jamaica	do	74/17/ 3	214.28	28/ 1/10	80.13			6/ 5/ 9	17.80	109/ 4/10	[1] 312.21
Do	U.S. dollar								10.05		10.05
Delegation expenses, Jamaica:											
Car hire	Pound					318/ 8/ 4	887.98			318/ 8/ 4	887.98
Dinners, luncheons	do			36/15/—	102.18					36/15/ 0	102.18
Embassy expenses	do							10/ 2/—	28.03	10/ 2/—	28.03
Gratuities	do							20/ 8/ 3	56.75	20/ 8/ 3	56.75
Taxis, meals, travelers checks, photographs, gratuities											
Delegation expenses, United States	U.S. dollar				81.95		5.55		27.31		114.81
Total			478.76		377.44		893.53		323.30		2,073.03

[1] $78.89 of this sum reimbursed to U.S. Treasury by Darrell St. Clair.

NOTE.—$263.10 in personal hotel bills not shown in this report were reimbursed to the U.S. Treasury.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$1,948.17
Appropriated funds: S. Res. 339, 88th Cong	124.86
Total	2,073.00

MARCH 11, 1965.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, American Delegation.

EULOGY OF LATE SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, with the death of Clair Engle on July 30, 1964, the country lost an able and dedicated legislator.

As a member of the House of Representatives, in which he served as the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, his leadership was a constructive force for the development and the use of the resources of America. His interest covered the whole field: water rights, electric power, the use of public lands, land reclamation, conservation, and development.

He carried to his work in the Congress—both in the House and in the Senate—a deep sense of reverence for the natural beauty and for the gifts of nature which are a part of the heritage of America. His actions in the Congress reflected the strength of the land which he represented. In all of his efforts he demonstrated his belief that the natural resources of America were meant to serve its people—not just for one generation, but indefinitely.

His death was not just a loss to the Congress, to his State, to the Nation, to the Democratic Party, but it was a great personal loss to everyone who had known him and his wife.

I, therefore, join in paying tribute to him for all of his achievements—as a Member of Congress, as a public servant—but also to pay personal tribute to him as a man of great courage and great integrity and one with a great capacity for friendship and for the sacrifices and understanding that go with the title of friend.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Clair Engle was a courageous man and a compassionate public servant. I know that his death has affected all the Members of the Congress with whom he served, both in the Senate and the House of Representatives, with a profound feeling of tragedy. To have this vigorous and vital man cut off in the prime of his life and the zenith of his public career, represents a great loss to all the people of the United States.

Clair Engle began his career of public service at an early age in his home State of California. From 1943 to 1958 he served with great distinction in the House of Representatives where he became chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He achieved much value for his own State and for the country as a whole. He helped build up a system of mighty dams throughout the great State of California, but he was always willing to help work for worthwhile projects for other areas as well.

Clair Engle was always willing to stand up and be counted for causes he knew to be just. We all remember when he came into the Senate in his wheelchair on June 10, 1964, to cast his vote to shut off debate on the civil rights bill. We also remember when he came here again on June 19, despite his desperate illness, to cast his affirmative vote in favor of the civil rights bill. No one would have blamed him for not coming for these votes, but Clair Engle remained true to himself by voting his convictions. He always placed the demands of his conscience first and foremost in his fulfillment of his public responsibilities.

We deeply regret the fading of his great light. The sympathies of my wife Bethine and myself will always be with his courageous and devoted wife, Lu. We who served with him in the Congress sorely miss him.

RECREATION FEES PURSUANT TO LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the regulations covering the recreation fees established pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. These regulations are prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

RECREATION FEES: REGULATIONS PROVIDING CRITERIA AND FEE SCHEDULES TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHMENT OF FEES PURSUANT TO LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897) authorizes the President to provide for the establishment of entrance, admission, and user fees at designated Federal recreation areas. Executive Order 11200 provided for the designation of areas at which such fees shall be charged and directed the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe a schedule of fees which may be collected at those areas. A new part 18 making provision for the establishment of recreation fees at designated areas is published below.

Although it is the policy of the Department of the Interior that whenever practicable the rulemaking requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act (5 U.S.C. 1003) be observed, it is imperative that this part take effect immediately because the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 became effective on January 1, 1965, and a delay in the estab-

lishment of recreation fees pursuant to the act will result in a loss of revenues to the Fund. In order to avoid such loss, this part shall become effective on the date of this regulation.

Subtitle A of title 43 is amended by the addition of a new part 18:

SEC.
18.1 Application.
18.2 Types of fees.
18.3 Annual fee.
18.4 Optional short-term fees.
18.5 Other entrance or admission fees.
18.6 User fees.
18.7 Continuation of current fees.
18.8 Exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions.

Authority: Sections 18.1 to 18.8 issued under section 2, 78 Stat. 897; Executive Order 11200.

Section 18.1. Application.

This part is promulgated pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, 78 Stat. 897, and Executive Order 11200. Any recreation fee which may be charged by the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the U.S. section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (United States and Mexico) shall be selected from the schedule of fees according to the criteria set forth in this part.

Section 18.2. Types of fees.

There shall be two general types of fees: entrance or admission fees and user fees. There shall be three types of entrance or admission fees: an annual fee, a fee for single visit or series of visits which may be paid in lieu of the annual fee, and a fee for a visit payable at areas to which the annual fee does not apply.

Section 18.3. Annual fee.

(a) Payment of the annual fee shall admit, without further payment during the year for which it was paid, the individual paying such fee and all those who accompany him in a private noncommercial automobile to all designated areas, except those areas which are specifically excluded from the coverage of the annual fee by the respective heads of the agencies and departments administering such areas. Individuals who choose not to pay the annual fee shall pay a fee for a single visit or series of visits. The annual fee for the period April 1, 1965, through March 31, 1966, and each 12-month period thereafter, shall be $7.

(b) The heads of the administering agencies and departments shall make the annual fee applicable to at least all those designated areas which (1) have a variety of recreation opportunities, and (2) which are commonly entered by automobile, unless exception to such application is made by the head of such agency. Examples of such areas include parks, water resource projects, forest areas, refuges, national recreation areas, and parts thereof.

Section 18.4. Optional short-term fees.

(a) The fee for a single visit or series of visits payable in lieu of the annual fee shall be paid by each individual who has reached his 16th birthday and shall be the option provided for in section 2(a)(ii) of Public Law 88-578. It shall be payable by persons who choose not to pay the annual fee, including all persons riding in automobiles, and all persons entering by any means other than private noncommercial automobile.

(b) This fee shall be applicable at all areas within the coverage of the annual fee. The fee shall be 25, 50, 75 cents or $1 per person per day at the discretion of the administering agency or department, provided that such agency or department head shall use the following criteria in selecting the exact fee:

1. The direct and indirect cost of the United States of establishing and maintaining the area.

2. The quality and variety of recreation opportunities offered in the area.

3. The amount charged for admission to or the use of comparable Federal, State, local, and private areas.

4. The impact of the fee on potential development of other outdoor recreation areas and facilities in the locality by State and local governments and by private investors.

5. The contributions of State and local governments and private organizations to the maintenance and development of the area.

(c) A weekly rate for 7 consecutive days of continuous or intermittent use shall be established at five times the daily rate.

Section 18.5. Other entrance or admission fees.

(a) The fee for a single visit payable at designated areas to which the annual fee does not apply shall be paid by each individual who has reached his 16th birthday. This fee shall be charged at designated areas which are not commonly entered by automobile. Such areas include, but are not limited to, certain historic sites, historic buildings, and monuments.

(b) This fee shall be $0.25, $0.50, $0.75, or $1 per person per visit, at the discretion of the head of the administering agency or department. The criteria mentioned in section 18.4 shall be used in selecting the exact fee.

Section 18.6. User fees.

(a) User fees are payable for the use of sites, facilities, equipment or services provided by the United States especially for recreationists in designated areas, which include, but are not limited to, well developed campsites, picnic areas, bathhouses, lockers, boat launching facilities, boats, other marine equipment, guide services, firewood, and winter sport facilities. User fees may be charged at designated areas singly or in addition to entrance or admission fees.

(b) User fees shall be selected from within the range of fees set forth below, and such selection shall be made only after consideration of the criteria set forth in section 18.4. User fees may be charged for additional types of sites, facilities, equipment and services not listed below, in such amounts as are recommended by the Secretary of the Interior.

RANGE OF USER FEES

Sites

Camp and trailer sites (for overnight use), $1 to $3.

Picnic sites (per site per day), $0.50 to $0.75.

Boat launching sites (daily fee), $0.50 to $1.50.

No such site shall be the subject of a user fee unless it contains or is within a reasonable distance of the following facilities:

Basic facility required	Camp and trailer sites	Picnic sites	Boat-launching sites
Access and circulatory roads [1]	X	X	X
Parking [1]	X	X	X
Drinking water	X	X	
Toilet facilities	X	X	X
Refuse containers	X	X	X
Picnic tables [2]	X	X	
Fire grates [2] or fireplaces	X	X	
Adequate tent or trailer spaces	X		
Boat launching ramps or facilities			X

[1] Except at campsites accessible only by boat.
[2] Not applicable to trailer sites.

Facilities

Lockers: $0.25 per locker daily.

Boat storage and handling: to be established at a daily, weekly, monthly, or annual rate in accord with the criteria set forth in section 18.4.

Elevators: at least 0.10 per person per round trip.

Ferries or other means of transportation: to be established at a rate in accord with the criteria set forth in section 18.4.

Bathhouses: $0.25–$0.50 per day per person, 6 years and over.

Swimming pools: to be established at a daily rate in accord with the criteria set forth in section 18.4.

Equipment

Boats, row: a minimum of $1 per poat per day or fraction thereof.

Boats, motorized: a minimum of $5 per boat per day or fraction thereof.

Services

Firewood: to be established at a rate in accord with the criteria set forth in section 18.4.

Guided tours: to be established at a rate in accord with the criteria set forth in section 18.4.

Section 18.7. Continuation of current fees

All recreation fees in effect on December 31, 1964, or on the last day when a charge was payable for public visitor use at the respective recreation areas, shall continue in effect for the period beginning the effective date of this part through March 31, 1965, except those fees which heretofore would permit entrance, admission or use for a period in excess of fifteen (15) days. Effective April 1, 1965, only the fees described in this part may be charged at designated areas.

Section 18.8. Exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions

In the application of the provisions of this part, the following exemptions, exclusions, and exemptions shall apply:

(a) Nothing contained herein shall authorize Federal hunting and fishing licenses or fees;

(b) No fee shall be charged for the use of any waters;

(c) No fee shall be charged for travel by private noncommercial vehicle over any national parkway, any road or highway established as part of the national Federal-aid system, or any road within the National Forest System, or a public land area, which, although it is part of a larger area, is commonly used by the public as means of travel between two places either or both of which are outside the area;

(d) No fee shall be charged any person in the exercise of a right of access to privately owned lands;

(e) No short-term entrance or admission fee shall be charged at any area where more than 50 percent of the land within such area has been donated to the United States by a State, unless the Governor of such State or his designee has been advised of such fee at least 60 days prior to its establishment and unless any recommendation of such Governor and all legal and other obligations of the United States to such State with respect to such areas have been taken into consideration;

(f) No fee shall be charged for access to waters or shorelines by those classes of persons which have rights thereto under treaty or law;

(g) No fee shall be charged for commercial or other activities not related to recreation;

(h) No entrance or admission fee shall be charged any person conducting State, local, or Federal Government business;

(1) No entrance or admission fee shall be charged at any entrance to Great Smoky Mountains National Park unless such fees are charged at main highway and thoroughfare entrances.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

AN ALASKAN VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, each year we in Congress look forward to reading the essays prepared by high school students across the country for the Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The statewide winner in Alaska this year is Miss Virginia Mann Rohr, a 16-year-old junior at Eielson High School. She is the daughter of Col. and Mrs. Louis W. Rohr, wing commander at Eielson Air Force Base. Because I believe Virginia's essay is a moving, well-written call to patriotism, I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Virginia Mann Rohr)

Facing all Americans today is a tremendously-important challenge that must be met with unfaltering determination—and it must be met now. That challenge is to keep America free.

No one sentence or lengthy paragraph can summarize the responsibilities of the citizen as well as our own Pledge of Allegiance. Let us examine this oath phrase by phrase, word for word, and see just what message it holds for each of us as citizens.

With hand over heart we recite, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America." Just what is this allegiance that we so freely pledge? "Webster's New World Dictionary" describes it as "the duty of being loyal to one's ruler, government, or country." When we utter this pledge, we are promising our loyalty and devotion to our flag.

Old Glory symbolizes, in its kaleidoscope of stars and stripes and brilliant hues of red, white, and blue, the hardiness and courage of the men who fought and still continue to fight for our liberty; the purity and innocence of those men and their fellow countrymen; the vigilance, perseverance, and justice which have been recognized as trademarks of our country.

With due reverence we say, "* * * * one nation under God." In this modern era of technological wonders too many people become engulfed in the material aspects of life. As the prodrome warns the physician of the onset of a disease, so the symptoms of selfishness, prejudice, and greed warn us of the materialism which grips our society today. As Christians and as Americans, we must prevent this cancer of hatred from becoming malignant and destroying the very ideals for which this country stands.

The United States was originally founded for want of a place to worship God, so let us be ever mindful of His presence and act accordingly.

On our national currency is stamped the phrase "In God We Trust." In respect to this phrase, may we look to Him for guidance and leadership in every decision we make—no matter how small or how momentous.

Then, with pride, we add, "* * * indivisible. * * *" We remain undivided in the face of such political poison as communism. As a dose of arsenic, once administered into the body, will rapidly stiffen the joints and suffocate its victim, so, communism, equally lethal, administered into the free world can and does stifle the representative voice of the people in the Government and eventually strangles democracy.

Even more startling, however, is the apathetic nature displayed by too many Americans toward this gradual pollution of free societies when they shirk the responsibilities of voting and obeying the law.

In conclusion, we say, "* * * with liberty and justice for all." Is the liberty and justice that we as a nation share, equal for all? No, it is not. In our daily lives we must strive to extend the wonderful blessing of freedom to all peoples of the world. First, however, such good intentions must be met at home. Let us all, regardless of race, religion, or creed, join into a brotherhood that will keep us unified and strong.

Now I will join these vital words and phrases into their original form: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Are we as citizens strong enough to honor this pledge to the fullest? With an eye to God, who blessed us with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and with a hand on the shoulder of our fellow man, we shall be.

OPERATION POLAR STRIKE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Exercise Polar Strike, the largest military exercise ever held in Alaska, has just been completed. The joint-combined exercise, under the direction of the Alaskan Command, involved Army and Air Force units from Alaska, 11 other States, and Canada. In addition, the exercise involved National Guard units from Alaska, Washington, and Minnesota.

Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, USAF, commander in chief, Alaska, said he is convinced that Polar Strike was one of the most important and valuable exercises ever held by the U.S. military forces.

The objectives of Exercise Polar Strike were peculiar to the northern latitudes; and while they are still under careful study, it appears that all were successfully met.

First of the objectives was to evaluate plans for the reinforcement of the Alaskan Command by the U.S. Strike Command and for continued operations in Alaska. The reinforcements included a reinforced Infantry brigade from Fort Lewis, Wash., supporting units from such widespread points as Fort Meade, Md.; Fort Bragg, N.C.; and, Fort Huachuca, Ariz.; and Air Force units from Dyess Air Force Base, Tex.; Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif.; and Sewart Air Force Base, Tenn. Men and equipment poured into Alaska, to form fighting elements that proved they could live, move, and operate under the extremes of the Alaskan winter.

Thus, they met a second objective—to provide participating forces with training in cold-weather operations. Temperatures in the exercise area dropped to well below 40° below zero; yet the forces continued to operate.

Another objective was to continue development of independent-brigade doctrines for operations in a cold-weather environment. To further this study, Exercise Polar Strike employed two strikingly different brigade organizations. The friendly force—made up of troops from Fort Lewis, Wash.; Fort Wainwright, Alaska; and, the Alaska National Guard—was a heavily mechanized force depending principally on ground movement by tracked vehicle, backed up by trucks. The aggressor force—composed of troops from Fort Richardson, Alaska, and a battalion of the Royal Canadian regiment—was a light air-mobile force, and included two companies of parachute troops. It was entirely supported by air. Thus, two separate types of brigade organizations faced each other in the exercise.

Yet another objective was to field test and evaluate equipment in cold-weather operations. Under test were vehicles and a number of items, ranging from cold-weather clothing to aviation control and safety aids. These tests are still being evaluated; and many of the items will continue to be tested under other conditions through the winter. But it is interesting to note that such testing goes on continually in Alaska; and, from it, some valuable changes have been made in the equipment of military units operating in the north.

A fifth objective was to evaluate and further develop procedures for the command and control of joint forces. In this area, too, Exercise Polar Strike saw some "firsts" for Alaska, as all three major headquarters—the Alaskan command; U.S. Army, Alaska; and the Alaskan air command—moved to the field for the maneuver. It was the first time the Alaskan air command had ever established a field headquarters for an Alaskan military exercise.

The sixth objective of Polar Strike was to provide the U.S. strike command with information to assist the determination of the desired ratio of fixed-wing—Army and troop carrier—to rotary-wing aircraft necessary to support a ROAD brigade operating independently in northern areas. There was heavier Air Force participation in Exercise Polar Strike than in any previous Alaskan combat test; and the results are still being studied carefully. However, the exercise did reinforce the knowledge that our military men in Alaska have had for many years—that combat activities in the North require greater air support than do those in other climates or more developed areas.

The final objective of the exercise was to refine and evaluate established procedures for logistical support of combat operations of ground and air forces under cold-weather conditions and to develop new logistical techniques and record requirement data. This, again, is a continuing area of study in Alaska. However, Polar Strike did reinforce the proof of the value of the support battalion, organic to infantry brigades, operating separately in the northern latitudes. This concept was tested in the ALCOM Alaskan exercise a year ago, and proved of such value that such battalions were formed, organic to the infantry brigades stationed in Alaska. Polar Strike was their first test as organic units, and com-

manders were unanimous in their praise of the support battalions.

Aside from these seven specific objectives, Exercise Polar Strike reinforced the rapidly widening belief that Alaska is the finest training ground available today to the U.S. military forces.

One example of such training was the guerrilla activity of special forces men working with Eskimos of the Alaska Army National Scout battalions. The special forces teams from Fort Bragg, N.C., trained with the Eskimos in villages on the periphery of Alaska for several days before Exercise Polar Strike, and then the special forces and Scouts were infiltrated into the exercise area. They formed guerrilla bands—half on the side of the friendly forces, and half on the side of the aggressors; and, throughout the exercise, they struck against the rear areas of their enemy. Such training for the special forces, the Scouts, and the regular forces who were forced to protect themselves against the guerrilla action, is invaluable for such operations as our Nation faces today in Vietnam.

The Canadian forces were able to provide their experience in cold-weather operations to United States forces. Pilots of the Canadian air arm, flying T–33 jet trainers, operated as tactical fighter pilots, flying in support of ground forces, making strikes against ground equipment and troops. These missions provided the Canadian flyers with excellent training and experience in providing air support for ground forces an area in which the RCAF has only recently begun serious study. Their air arm has been oriented primarily toward transport and continental air defense, in the past. The integration of tactics equipment and personnel of the two nations contributed immeasurably to the interplay of knowledge and to the overall success of the operation.

The Alaska Air National Guard played a significant role in the logistical support area of Exercise Polar Strike, ferrying cargo and personnel between points within Alaska and the main exercise area—a role the guard would certainly play during an actual emergency. Initial movement of troops and equipment from the mainland of the United States was carried out by the Military Air Transport Service—MATS. During the course of the exercise, MATS also transported equipment, especially outsize cargo, within Alaska and the exercise area. According to General Reeves, the MATS operations were most successful.

A number of other "firsts" were established during Polar Strike. This was the first winter exercise planned and directed fully by Alaskan command headquarters. For the first time, Tactical Air Command's C–130 aircraft used frozen lakes as assault landing fields, delivering troops to the combat zone. F–104 fighters provided the first aerial delivery of simulated chemical and bacteriological agents to the battle area by high-performance jet aircraft. This was the first time a reinforced Army brigade was delivered into the Arctic exercise area, supplied during the exercise, and withdrawn from the area—completely by air.

Polar Strike was the first exercise to use a readily recognizable mark for distinguishing between friendly and enemy aircraft. During the exercise, all planes flying missions in support of the enemy forces carried a red fuselage-mounted tank. Friendly aircraft flew without this marking. As a result, aircraft were readily identified by player forces.

The exercise area was a virtual wilderness of some 8,000 square miles—larger than the State of Massachusetts. It encompassed all kinds of terrain found in the North, except glaciers, and faced the troops with the problems of operating in a region where there are virtually no roads, no installed communications, and almost no population. Alaska is the only place in the United States where such realistic training conditions may be found.

Aside from the ruggedness of the terrain, exercise Polar Strike was carried out during a long period of extreme cold. This offered an excellent opportunity not only to test equipment, but also to observe and evaluate the effect of extended activity in subzero climate on the men in the field. Using exercise Polar Strike as a laboratory, medical officers studied all facets of cold-weather effects on the ability of the men to live and fight in northern environments. Such observations are a continuing effort on the part of our military forces in Alaska.

Despite the obstacles presented by such a training area, morale and professional interest were high at all levels during exercise Polar Strike.

Lieutenant General Reeves said the exercise proved again that the Army and the Air Force can work together as a complete team under the most adverse conditions, as they did during the exercise.

Mr. President, last fall, General Reeves extended to me a verbal invitation, while I was visiting him at Alaskan command headquarters at Elmendorf Air Force Base, to attend the winter exercise. Later, a written invitation followed. From the time when the invitation was first extended, I hoped that the stars would be in a favorable position and that I would be able to go. I did go.

Arriving at Fort Greely, south of Fairbanks, just a few days before the exercise was completed, I had the great privilege of going out to the field with General Reeves, General Carver, and others, to witness the maneuvers. Mr. President, the performance of the officers and men was magnificient. Some of them had been in the field, living under rugged conditions, for as long as 3 weeks, with the temperature sometimes dropping to below minus 50° F. It was my observation that morale was high. Many Alaskans and many soldiers from other States participated in the exercise. Additionally, Lt. Col. Bernard J. B. Archambault, commanding officer, 2d Battalion, of the Royal Canadian Regiment, and officers and men of that regiment participated.

As has been mentioned, this was the first occasion of the many similar maneuvers in which the exercise director was the commander in chief of the Alaskan Command. Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves was at Fort Greely from the time when the exercise commenced until it was concluded, as were Maj. Gen. George A. Carver, commanding general, U.S. Army, Alaska; Maj. Gen. James C. Jensen, commander, Alaskan Air Command; and Brig. Gen. Andy A. Lipscomb, commanding general, the Yukon Command. General Lipscomb served as chief umpire.

As one high officer told me, "Any man trained to fight in these Arctic conditions is trained to fight anywhere in the world." The job of airlifting troops to the maneuver areas was a tremendous one. The job of supply and resupply was almost herculean. The job of keeping mechanical equipment in operation in subzero temperatures was one which I did not believe could be accomplished; but it was. It was interesting to me to learn that until the time when I left, only 13 cases of frostbite had required hospitalization.

For my part, I want to thank General Reeves and all of those of his command who made it possible for me to be with them, and who assuredly furthered my education and gave me renewed confidence in the ability and endurance and morale of our officers and men in the armed services. Col. George T. Adair, commanding officer, Fort Greely, was a kind and thoughtful host. It was an exhilarating and worthwhile experience for me.

Polar Strike was a tremendous success.

THE HOSPITAL SHIP "HOPE"

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Lowell (Mass.) Sun has eloquently summarized the achievements of the SS *Hope*, the great, white hospital ship that brings modern medical knowledge and health to millions all over the world.

As the editorial points out, the good ship *Hope* has sailed to three continents: Asia, South America, and Africa. In 4 years, she has trained hundreds of doctors and nurses in Indonesia, South Vietnam, Peru, Ecuador, and Guinea.

Hundreds of thousands have directly benefited from treatments by *Hope* doctors. Many thousands more have received their first vaccinations or their first pints of milk from *Hope*.

Most important, however, the education of the medical personnel in these developing nations is being dispersed throughout the countries, and the knowledge will benefit many generations to come.

This flow of education, Mr. President, is the outstanding achievement of the American men and women in white who volunteer their time and talents with *Hope* that the Lowell Sun editorial salutes; and I ask that the editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

"HOPE" AFLOAT

American programs of assistance to friendly peoples the world over take many forms. One with magnificent potential for lasting good, although less well publicized than some, is called simply Project Hope.

The word stands for Health Opportunity for People Everywhere, and the program's

principal activity is the dispatch of a hospital ship, the SS *Hope*, to areas in need for higher standards of medical care.

The ship's major function is that of teaching, although in the course of instructing doctors and medical assistants in modern techniques it renders treatment to hundreds of men, women, and children. The *Hope* carries a full complement of medically trained personnel and is especially equipped with operating theaters, laboratories, and libraries, for postgraduate courses for native doctors.

Already in its 3 years afloat, the *Hope* has visited Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It is operated by the People-to-People Health Foundation, a nonprofit organization which receives some Government support but exists principally on contributions from business and private sources. Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson all have heartily endorsed its work.

"OPINION IN THE CAPITAL"—INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR DODD

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 14, 1965, the regular "Opinion in the Capital" program, originating on channel 5, in Washington, D.C., carried an interview with the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], by Mark Evans, vice president for public affairs for Metromedia, Inc., and Jack Bell, chief Senate correspondent of the Associated Press.

I watched the program, personally, and was once again impressed by the calm and knowledgeable manner in which the Senator from Connecticut dispenses common sense on many of the major issues of our day, particularly the situation in Vietnam, concerning which the Senator from Connecticut has spoken so eloquently and wisely on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

For those who may not have had an opportunity to view this program, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the interview be printed in the RECORD.

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

OPINION IN THE CAPITAL

(Produced by Florence Lowe, a Metropolitan Broadcasting television production, 8 p.m., March 14, 1965)

Guest: Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Reporters: Mark Evans, vice president for public affairs for Metromedia, Inc., Jack Bell, chief Senate correspondent, Associated Press.

Mr. EVANS. Jack, with a man with as many varied interests as Senator DODD, I'm sure we're in for a windfall. Why don't you begin?

FIREARMS

Mr. BELL. Senator, are you prepared to go as far as the President as suggested in his message on crime in dealing with this gun situation?

Senator DODD. Yes, I am now. I started out with just handguns. That's what I originally proposed. I then amended it to include the long gun: the rifle, the shotgun. I'm now prepared to say "Let's bar all mail-order traffic in guns." Because the situation has worsened progressively. I say we're at a point where we ought to put an end to all of it.

Mr. EVANS. You've been a "John the Baptist" sort of fellow, crying in the wilderness for a long time, Senator. Did you sell the President on the idea?

Senator DODD. No, no. I wish I could take credit for that. I do feel that our committee did some educational work generally with the public: we held hearings: we conducted investigations: the staff did a great amount of work, and all of this, I hope, contributed to the President's better understanding of the menace we're facing.

Mr. BELL. Senator, you're a hunter. Is this going to affect hunters materially?

Senator DODD. No. You're quite right, I've been a hunter, I own guns. I'm not against legitimate sports activity, I'm for it. But I see nothing in this proposal or the bill which I've introduced, which will in any way, impair the legitimate sportsman.

NARCOTICS

Mr. EVANS. Many of these bills that you've been fostering for a long time now Senator are coming to the floor and it looks as though something might happen. The House, last week, passed a unanimous decision on the "goofball" bill which has been very much in your mind. Are you expecting success on this too?

Senator DODD. Oh sure. The Senate passed that bill last year unanimously. It was the bill I introduced in the Senate, Congressman HARRIS took it up in the House, did a good job with it. No one deserves any particular credit. These things only needed emphasis, education, as far as the public was concerned. They needed to be done, and they are getting done.

Mr. EVANS. There has been much said in the past, of the British system in allocating narcotics. I know that you've studied this long and hard. Do you have any feelings on the British system? Does it have anything in its favor?

Senator DODD. I have this feeling. I think that we should really take the approach that they do with respect to the narcotic addict. I think he's truly a sick man. Some of them get into criminal activities and this has to be dealt with separately. But, generally they ought to be viewed as ill people.

Mr. BELL. What about the problem of marihuana as far as young people are concerned?

Senator DODD. I think we're right about marihuana. There's a big argument about this I know. There are those who say there is nothing really addictive about it. That it's just a step beyond tobacco or something of that sort. The best information I get is that this is not so. That it is addictive, that it is damaging, that it leads to other addictions—more serious. Like heroin.

Mr. BELL. Is there anything about marihuana that's been official—that we need it in a "drug" sense?

Senator DODD. Not that I know of. I don't know of any.

Mr. EVANS. You said that these people are sick, Senator. Do you mean by that that these people should be able to go to the drug store with a doctor's prescription and be——

Senator DODD. That's what the British do. I have some misgivings about that in our society. There are differences in our society and the British—the British police officer doesn't carry a gun. I can't imagine what would happen in this country if we took guns away from all our police officers. They seem to do better with some things—maybe they can do better with—for some reasons I can't describe. I don't know.

But, it seems for us, anyway, unwise to me to allow the narcotic addict to get a prescription, go in and take care of his habit in that way. I'd rather see them hospitalized, treated, eased back into life through the use of stopover houses. I think there are a lot of things we can do short of allowing them to get drugs freely.

VIETNAM

Mr. BELL. Senator, I'd like to get into Vietnam at this point: You've recently made a strong statement in the Senate in favor of President Johnson's course there. Since you made that statement that war has been even more escalated. Do you favor a continuation of the escalation of that war?

Senator DODD. I said on other occasions, Jack, and I'll repeat it here. I'm not a military man. It's difficult for me to answer a question of that kind. I think that really is a question that the President can answer after consulting with his top military technicians and strategists. I think it's fair to point out that the escalation hasn't been initiated by us. It's the Communists that have escalated the war. What do we do to cause them to withdraw from their aggression in Vietnam? Well, the President obviously feels that we have got to give them some of the same medicine they've been dishing out to the free Vietnamese. How much—how far? I truly don't know the answer to that. I suppose the President would say as much as it takes to get them to cease and desist from their aggression, subversion, infiltration.

Mr. EVANS. From your speech, Senator, I get the feeling you feel the Red Chinese will not come to the aid of the North Vietnamese with troops. You also pointed out that they are too vulnerable on the coast with their industrial cities.

Senator DODD. This is a risked judgment. Who can say? It seems that way to me from all I can learn about their situation—their geographical situation, their economic situation, their differences with the Moscow Communists, all add up to me, to an unlikelihood that they would take us on if I may put it that way in an all-out struggle. I don't think that will happen, but I could be proved wrong in the next minute. You've got to take risks in life—you've got to take risks to protect freedom. We can't just sit back and worry all the time. "If we do this, that will happen to us"—get into a state of do-nothingism. I think all of life is risks—freedom and we've got to take some of those risks.

Mr. BELL. You made the point in your speech that our intelligence is not very good in South Vietnam. How are we going to know when the point has been reached where the Communists are about to give up, or are at least in retreat?

Senator DODD. I guess again, that we would hear through so-called neutral sources, friends, I assume. I'm confident that those channels are open. When they are ready to say "uncle" we'll hear it loud and clear. Will we see it in the military sense? I suppose so. I think we ought to know the result of their reprisals on our attacks—economic centers, military centers. I think we ought to know that. I think we ought to hear—I hope our intelligence improves and I think it is improving. I think it's better than it was, from what I'm told.

Mr. EVANS. I think one of the most enlightened statements in your speech is where you indicated that one of our problems has been a rotation of our own leadership and you also pointed out that in the 5 years, there have been 10 or 12 topflight men who have made real inroads, friendshipwise, with the political leaders, religious leaders, and military leaders and you're going to write a letter to the President urging that these 10 or 12 men be sent back there to see if we could bind all the forces together. Have you done that?

Senator DODD. Yes, I wrote to the President—I have also talked to some of his top staff people. The President has written back and answered my letter. He said in effect, he thought there was something to it. He was looking into it and so on. I think it

received consideration and is receiving consideration. In the letter, I don't think I mentioned any names but in personal conversation I did. I don't want to do that here because it won't be fair to those individuals. Sometimes I find that there are personality conflicts and this is the most regrettable thing of all. It seems to me that the stakes are so high that we can't afford to dwell on personalities and their difficulties. If there are more than two involved it seems to me they ought to be able to submerge what personal differences they have. If competence of an unusual character is involved and it is in some of these people, they ought to go back, and they want to go back, and they could be helpful if they went back.

Mr. BELL. One of your colleagues, Senator Young of Ohio, called for the replacement of General Taylor as our ambassador. Are you satisfied with Taylor operations there?

Senator DODD. Yes, I have a very high opinion of General Taylor. I think he's a wonderful man. I don't know him well really, but I've observed him at committee hearings and I've had a few contacts with him. He's made a topflight impression on me. His record is outstanding. I'm sure he has some personality defects. Who doesn't? I think he's good and I think he's well balanced and I think he's a good man on the job.

Mr. BELL. One of Senator Young's objections to General Taylor is that he has a military viewpoint. Do you think that is true? We're stressing too much the military?

Senator DODD. No, I don't think that's true. Of course, as you and I know, he does have a military viewpoint. He should have, and I'm glad he does have because the big problem right now in Vietnam is military. I have found that these good military people are the best advocates of peace. You show me a good soldier that's been through a war and I'll show you the fellow that's really for peace. So, I don't worry about that in the case of Taylor. There is something to the argument that this or that military man is so militaristic that he can't handle a civilian problem, but this—you and I could cite classic examples of outstanding soldiers like Eisenhower, for example, who became great civilian leaders.

Mr. EVANS. Senator, I don't think I've ever done this on TV before, but I can't commend you highly enough for this speech you made on the Senate floor. I would like to offer people who are watching this program, the availability of this speech, if you write to Senator THOMAS DODD, or the station to which you are now listening, or viewing, I would be very happy to see that you get a copy of this speech. It's probably the most articulate, well-rounded and definitive story of the Vietnamese problem that has ever come down the pike. Jack, I hope you agree with that.

Senator DODD. I don't know whether Jack agrees or not, but I sure do.

Mr. EVANS. One of the points you make Senator, is that we have done a bad job in political war—we have failed to fight back—we have failed to take the initiative. We're always on the reaction instead of the action side. I think you pointed out that we should infiltrate the North Vietnamese with guerrillas.

Senator DODD. I think we should. Guerrillas and infiltrators.

Mr. EVANS. You pointed this out some years ago and nothing happened.

Senator DODD. I've been talking about it for a long time. I was over there about 4 years ago—I wasn't there very long and I don't pose as any expert on it but I was there and I got a look. I got some feel, better than I had before I went anyway. It's not only true in Vietnam, it's true in all these trouble spots. I think it is a failure in our policy. I think we ought to give back to them what they give to us. Anyway, it's a new technique in the struggles of the world. Why shouldn't we have free world infiltrators and free world conspirators among the Communists? There is nothing more effective than a conspiracy of truth.

Mr. EVANS. Have you had any encouragement on this?

Senator DODD. Yes, oh, Yes. I'm quite confident, that the administration, if I may put it that way, thinks that this is right. I think they have been thinking about it anyway. I am not suggesting this is any original idea. It has been talked about by a number of people.

Mr. BELL. What's the CIA doing in there? If it isn't doing something of this sort?

Senator DODD. I hope it is. I don't think it has done it well enough and I don't think it has been effective enough. There responsibility however, is a little different from what I had in mind. As I understand it, they are supposed to get information which will be helpful to us. My idea, I'm sure I didn't make it clear enough, is that the free world infiltrator would get in and propagandize among the people, the average "Joe" if I may put it that way, in North Vietnam * * * get him actively engaged in one way or another in impeding the government, harassing the Communist government.

Mr. EVANS. Build his hopes on what the free world would offer?

Senator DODD. Sure. I don't know if the CIA does that or not.

Mr. BELL. Wouldn't that go against the gram of our being nonaggressive?

Senator DODD. Well, I suppose if you want to be real technical about it you could say so. But that brings me to a point: I think that freedom requires a kind of aggression. I want to be, and I think you do too, want to be aggressive about liberty and about decency, this is what religion is all about. It's kind of aggression. Religious people don't take up clubs and stones, but they are morally aggressive. That's what I mean. They denonuce sin and evil and wrong and I think we should.

Mr. EVANS. One of the greatest arguments used against our negotiations in Vietnam is that the French, with a sizeable army, got clobbered in that part of the world, and that we, with only advisors, can hope to do no better. In your speech you touch on this and I wish you would elaborate.

Senator DODD. Well, what my view is, and I think it is sound, there is not any real likeness between the problem the French had with Vietnam and the South Vietnamese have which we are trying to help them solve. The French were there as colonialists. They were exploiting the country. They were taking out of it * * * they were putting very little into it. They were hated, literally, by most Vietnamese. There were many people in Vietnam who fought with the Communists against the French, who are now fighting against the Communists. They were first doing that because they wanted their country free of French imperialism. So no wonder the French lost. So will anybody else if they try to hold the people under the thumb of imperial government.

Mr. EVANS. What I wanted to bring out was, that you suggested that SEATO should bounce Mr. De Gaulle and France because of their lack of interest and influence.

Senator DODD. I don't think France has any proper place in the SEATO organization. The South East Asia Treaty Organization, like NATO, was set up to help defend freedom in that part of the world. France has no proper place there. She's trying to hang on. My own fear is that De Gaulle thinks he may get some trade or economic advantage out of the Communists if they win the struggle. I think he's that shortsighted. I don't mean that he's a Communist, of course, I don't. But he's moving around in strange ways, hard to understand and his shortsightedness reveals itself in this area as well as in several others. I think France ought to get out of SEATO, resign, or get thrown out.

Mr. BELL. Senator, that brings us to the point of what do we do if a neutralist government should take over and we are asked to get out. Our objectives there are to keep these people in South Vietnam free, but also we are there, according to the President, because we have been asked to be there. So, what do we do if a neutralist takes over?

Senator DODD. Well, if a true neutralist takes over with the protection that a neutralist government should have, I don't think we would have any real problem. I suppose that's all we are trying to do anyway. Should be and I'm sure it is. But, when the Communists use the word, "Neutralism" they don't really mean neutralism, they mean neutralism for our side. So, that I think would be a different situation. I have been asked this question before. I don't think it would happen. If and what we would do if an "untrue neutralist government" took over, that is, one partial to the Communists, I suppose it would be opposed by elements in Vietnam that were devoted to freedom and anti-Communists, so I think perhaps we would carry on the struggle with the anti-Communist neutralist. This word, "neutralist" has taken on a connotation that's ugly. It has a good meaning in its legitimate use. I find myself always arguing against neutralism but I think I fail to point out each time, that I am for neutralism, I'm against Communist neutralism.

NUREMBERG TRIALS

Mr. EVANS. Senator, you having been on the Nuremberg Trials, we are about to see the expiration of the statute of limitations. How do you feel about that? Do you think they should expire?

Senator DODD. No, no, I don't think so at all and I don't think it is going to either, from what I hear and read. My view is very simple—as long as there is any one person in Germany or beyond its boundaries, who has had any part in the dreadful crimes committed by the Nazi regime, he should be brought to book.

RAILROADS

Mr. EVANS. The New Haven Railroad is in trouble too. It's in your bailiwick. Do you have any prescriptions or panaceas for the line?

Senator DODD. I offered a bill that would call for the Federal Government to put up matching funds, matching State or municipal funds. I think something like this has got to happen or else this railroad is going out of business. We have to have it in Connecticut as well as other States in that area—commuter service, freight service—of course, I think the railroad is in its present posture because of dreadfully bad management over the years. I see nothing else that can be done except for the Government and the State governments to get it back on its feet. I believe because I talked with those whom I consider well informed on railroad problems, that it can be done—efficiently and properly operated. But now it needs a blood transfusion. We got to get it well before it can do better. I was a little bit discouraged because the Assistant Secretary of Commerce went before the Interstate Commerce Subcommittee recently and said the Government shouldn't give any help. I think that's wrong—I hope that's not the view of the administration, otherwise I fear the railroad will go down the drain.

Mr. EVANS. You just want to make sure they get the right blood type.

Senator DODD. I do.

Mr. BELL. Senator, what's the future of this high speed rail line between Washington and Boston? Is there any future in this?

Senator DODD. I do think so, Jack, I think Senator PELL has the right idea on this. I think that is what we have to come to. But I think again, this will take time, several years before it will get into operation. Yes, right type blood transfusion is what we need in the meantime.

OTEPKA CASE

Mr. EVANS. The country is pretty much interested in the Otepka case which seems to fall below the horizon occasionally. I know you have been a strong advocate of this man's rights. Where does it stand now?

Senator DODD. The hearing for Otepka in the Department of State, which he requested, has been postponed several times, at his request. I wish they would get on with it and get it done. I think Otepka is waiting for the Senate subcommittee to complete its hearings so that he will have the hearings available for whatever help he thinks it will give him. The State Department, understandably, wants to get on with it. My own view is that it's a mistake on all sides here. This matter ought to be resolved and it can be very simple. Otepka has a lot of ability. He ought to be taken back. I don't say on this or that job, but he ought to be brought back into the Department and put to work. The thing got off on the wrong foot. I think Otepka probably got a little touchy about things that were not of consequence, encouraged by well-meaning friends, the Department got its back up, can't be made to appear as backing down * * * it's all nonsense to me. Let them both back down and let us get on with the business of getting the job done.

Mr. BELL. Do you have more hearings scheduled on it?

Senator DODD. Very briefly. We have some testimony to take to wind it up—witnesses we have already heard.

ADOPTIONS

Mr. EVANS. Can you give me one quick answer, Senator on the black market baby.

Senator DODD. Baby bill? The bill, as you know was reported out of the Judiciary Committee again this year, passed the Senate unanimously, last year, it is a good bill, it will put some curb on this bad uncontrolled traffic in babies for sale, these brokers, these shyster lawyers, and unscrupulous people.

Mr. EVANS. You think it will pass?

Senator DODD. I do.

A NEW CONSERVATIVE MANIFESTO

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on December 29, 1964, Look magazine printed an article, by T. George Harris, Look senior editor, entitled "A New Conservative Manifesto."

One need not be a member of the Republican Party or wear the "conservative" label to be impressed by the conclusions drawn in the article—critical of radicalism, but urging that citizens not be blindly negative in this changing world of exploding population, knowledge, and problems, but that they be "problem-solution directed"; that citizens need not advocate Federal or even Government solutions for every problem; but that they must, if aware and concerned, recognize that there are great and serious problems, and must feel responsible to offer alternative solutions.

Mr. President, in the hope that all our citizens will become more conscious of the tremendous problems brought about by our growth and population, urbanization, and technological and scientific development, and will be motivated to study and think toward various solutions to these problems, rather than be automatically against any solution proposed, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[Reprinted from the Dec. 29, 1964 issue of Look]

A NEW CONSERVATIVE MANIFESTO

(By T. George Harris)

Nice ladies and gentlemen in 44 States have been congratulating each other since election night. We've disposed of Goldwaterism, they say with self-satisfaction, and taught the conservatives a lesson they were too crude to learn any other way. Now, back to the politics of normalcy and moderate accents in the GOP.

They were wrong. Goldwaterism will not evaporate. It brought into the open and voiced, however inadequately, however negatively, the concern, the fear of many bewildered Americans. Goldwater's radical conservative supporters turned to him because they wanted a prophet to lead them out of a modern wilderness. The prophet failed, but the radical conservative is still there.

He is a troubled citizen. In his heart, he still knows that something's wrong. Bad wrong. He will cite you a thousand specifics, from the debt to fluoridation and the fourth estate's liberalism. But his underlying anguish, legitimate and deep, can be found at the sore core of modern life.

There, the individual man or woman cannot long escape an aching doubt—what does he matter to his neighbors, his State, his country? Is a man only a social security number? An instinct warns millions that they are losing the capacity for personal acts that mean anything to anybody. The instinct is decent; its frustration is deadly.

People rising into affluence can feel, more keenly than hungry men, the threat of mortal insignificance. This creeping fear is the raw material of most contemporary literature and theology. After we fill our animal needs for food and shelter, millions of us bump up hard against the larger need for a meaningful role among fellow men. Without it, we are fat beasts caged in ranchhouses.

One of the very human responses to the soft indignities of U.S. life can be found in the hard doctrines of radical conservatism. It has, by organizing an agony, become the most significant political movement of the late 20th century.

Its converts, to whom conservative is a word in flaming capitals, talk of rugged individualism, for they feel the modern threat to the person. Their extreme urgency, which drives them to their radicalism, shocks any traditional conservative (the old common-noun variety) who comes close enough to feel it (see "What Is an Extremist?" Look, October 20). The radical conservative, dwarfed by big Government, big labor and big business, often kicks the whole machinery, Wall Street and all, if only to make it honor him with a flinch.

His dread spreads. He comes to believe that his country is roaring down the road to ruin, too drunk to heed the warning signals. Patriotism of the heart calls him to do something. Who's to blame? Only one answer sounds ominous enough to match the premonition of evil felt within: The Communist conspiracy, which not only menaces the Nation, but, more to the point, is the archetype of the collectivism that smothers a man.

Senator Goldwater, obviously not soft on anything, touched and sensitized this populist discontent. He was in turn shaped by it. In his years of jet-speed campaigning, he became more emphatic and, like any speaker, bore down harder on the phrases and politics that aroused passionate acclaim in his audiences. The radical conservative movement made him its champion and needed only passive help from the GOP Old Guard to nominate him for President of the United States.

The movement gained strength from Senator Goldwater's campaign. By seizing the Republican label for their candidate, this minority of the minority party claimed the endorsement of 26 million voters. The landslide that covered him only hid for a moment the protest that made him.

PROTEST WITHOUT A PROGRAM

Radical conservative organizations and workers became the dominant voice in most Republican State parties months before they picked convention delegates dedicated to their man (see "The Rampant Right Invades the GOP," Look, July 16, 1963). The new breed of political activist, a fanatic volunteer, enveloped the weaker party with speakers and pamphlets. Whatever happens in the GOP National Committee, the right wing will set the tone for much of the party apparatus.

Complacents outside the movement have for years tried to ignore it, or explain it away. But their standard explanations are self-collapsing. To say that the conservative is sick, as many liberals charge, is to say that a sickness, even to despair, is epidemic in the land. To say that he has been converted by propagandists, as the post office suspects, is only to say that he buys what they sell. To say that he is irrational, as moderates believe, is only to say that urgent human needs lie deep in the spirit. To say that legions of know-nothings have risen from the grave to revive conspiracy politics, as scholars declare, is to focus upon democracy's turmoil in times of far less radical change.

Since the crisis settled into the Republican Party, it has been a body convulsed as if by demons. Each daily paper reports another tremor in its trunk and limbs. Leaders maneuver cagily for ways to mix the conflicting humors of the radical conservatives and the element to which they are by nature allergic—the accommodating "me too" wing of conservatism's grand old party. The power struggle within the organization will never be resolved, and may kill the GOP, unless the men who call themselves moderates hear the message of the movement and find a principle on which to respond to it.

This is hard to do, for the protest has been without a program. The movement's facile editor, William F. Buckley, Jr., who claimed credit for "purifying" Senator Goldwater's thought and later for engineering his candidacy, once wrote a book-length essay "Up From Liberalism," to prove that his conservatism needs only a "no-program" like this: "I will not willingly cede more power to anyone, not to the State, not to General Motors, not to the CIO." Of course, the beatnik also asserts his personal liberty against all the "rat race" institutions that load a man with responsibility. But Buckley clothed his self-centered protest in an economic doctrine, anticommunism and the gaudy wit of an expert college debater. Senator Goldwater, in 1961, endorsed it all without reservation.

But this year he tried, as the candidate for the highest office, to do better. He needed to reach beyond the zealots up front to the silent citizens back in the crowds. Failing, he retreated to the rhetoric of communism within the gates, hinting treason as the reason for an untidy world. On his last day of running, as he heard the rumble of the voter avalanche starting down, he told the voters of Fredonia, Ariz., how he had wanted to talk about an America that only they, still near the stand-tall legend of the Old West, could understand.

The pain creeps upon us now, however, not back in Tombstone days. And so, perhaps, does a way to start to work upon it.

Out of the conservative ferment, one little-known man has begun to draw a nourishing stream of ideas. As old as the country and as new as today's rediscovery, his thought reaches the core of the protest, but earns the respect of any liberal who comprehends it.

The man is Richard C. Cornuelle, 37, of San Mateo, Calif. He is neither a bigwig in politics nor a captain of industry. An earnest though humorous idealist, he comes out of that set-apart world of conservative foundations and causes. Once a young right-wing pamphleteer, he steeped himself in a formidable literature—the European thought that has rigidified the present U.S. movement. But his Presbyterian conscience and his young mind drove him beyond dogma, and a few men of wealth and wisdom trusted him with money to test his ideas. He stumbled sometimes and stuttered, but his thought and work took him on a pilgrimage of principle into social experiment far more substantial than Brook Farm.

He hunted immediate ways to reduce our dependence, now and in the future, upon the Federal pills for all ills. With more imagination than any before, he found tactics for nudging private institutions into deliberate attack upon public problems. It may seem odd, though it shouldn't, that he cribbed some of his methods from Chicago's Saul Alinsky, the toughest civil rights leader yet to appear.

What happened? Only enough, so far, to promise much more. Because of Cornuelle, commercial bankers in 49 States now lend millions to needy college students. Galvanized by his thought, the National Association of Manufacturers, not famous for charity work among the unemployed, labored all year on its own "poverty program" to employ the unemployable. Because of his specific results and compelling analysis of U.S. institutions, a few key Republicans on both sides of the ideological divide now hope to turn the party machinery into something more than an instrument of nay-saying, be it moderate or immoderate.

"The success of the Republican political position depends only incidentally on politics," Cornuella believes, rejecting the election-year cynicism of party hacks. "The GOP action program should provide detailed blueprints for private action, and State and local action, on public problems. Then we must produce results, not just gripe at the Government for trying to. We need to compete, not just at the Federal level, but at every level where the public business is debated and acted upon. Conservatives have been demanding political power before they first accepted responsibility."

These notions may sound grandiose to you, or like another revival of hopes that have failed before. I'd feel that way had I not, as a reporter, followed the years of work that brought Cornuelle's body of thought to its present half-finished shape. His book, "Reclaiming the American Dream," is the first installment of a new conservative manifesto. Because it breaks the ideological logjam, you may find it important enough, whatever your politics, to know about even before it goes to the printer.

"I am tired of angry books about America," Cornuelle writes, his belly full of accumulated conservative despair. "You will find this a hopeful book. It does not say the country is going to hell. It says that, perhaps for the first time in her history, America can go wherever she wants to go."

The tone tells more than Cornuelle knows. Those who participate in his effective projects come to talk like the purposeful, yeasty reformers of the early New Deal. They shuck off the helpless pessimism, the random anger and the conspiratorial obsession that mark the 1964 conservative. Like Cornuelle, they find a working redemption from insignificance. They matter, and they know it.

THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

Cornuelle's best break came a few years back with one simple insight. He spotted the flaw in the standard two-part division of U.S. institutions into the "public sector," which is Government, and the "private sector," which in the main is profitmaking enterprise. Many rely upon this two-tined fork, a tool of conventional wisdom, for any probe of the U.S. system. Liberals tend to trust only Government for serious work. Rightwingers trust only the other prong, private enterprise. Both, Cornuelle saw, miss something fundamental. Neither category offers working space for thousands of distinctive institutions and millions of public-spirited people. He listed a few: 6,000 private foundations worth $14.5 billion; 320,000 churches with 118 million members; 131 labor unions with 13.5 million members; the political parties themselves, and thousands of political "education" outfits from the Birch Society to the ban-the-bomb'ers; 18,000 little and big business associations, plus farm, professional and scholarly groups; 100,000 welfare groups like United Fund; action outfits all the way from civil rights militants to the Association for Retarded Children; 190 million Americans who, beyond the work they are paid for and the one vote each citizen can cast, do such personal things as contribute $7 billion a year to worthy causes.

"These are tremendous raw resources," he noted. "I can hardly imagine a task too great for them." But they don't seem to be doing much.

We notice them mainly when, as pressure groups, they lobby for Government action. They also, less obviously but to greater effect, serve as a lever on the profitmaking sector—as when labor unions bargain for pay and pensions, and private universities raise money to lift general educational standards. So Cornuelle began to see the middle institutions as a hidden fulcrum.

Puzzled that scholars had done so little to define this fulcrum action, Cornuelle hunted his way back to Alexis de Tocqueville, whose 1835 book, "Democracy in America," spelled out more clearly than any before or since the genius of our revolution. Eureka. Tocqueville had considered associations, as he called the middle institutions, the distinctive and unique force in our democracy.

"Nothing is more deserving of our attention," Tocqueville wrote. Upon these groups, he knew, depends our country's progress.

Cornuelle labeled his rediscovery "the independent sector." Then he set out to see why, if it had once been so decisive and today commands even greater raw resources, it has become a mere incidental to any analysis of the mass, affluent society. He wondered if it would be squeezed down to nothing by the vigor of business and Government.

The main failure was easy to spot. As a board member of a local charity, Cornuelle had suffered through reports "on how many lap robes the needlework committee knitted." The charity's social workers, lacking any competitive gage of competence or even Government-style budgeting, had no notion of how to get the best out of their resources. Most independent institutions, he knew, operate on 19th century skills, ideas, and organizations. "We still roll bandages and knit mufflers in the missile age," he noted. Could the independent sector leap into the 20th century?

So began the first Cornuelle experiment. It was 1958, after sputnik, and Congress was launching, through the National Defense Education Act, a program of Federal loans to worthy students. Why didn't the bankers do the job? When Cornuelle hesitantly asked them why not try, most said, "too risky * * * no profit." So he set up an independent agency to lever banks into action. With tax-exempt contributions from business, he founded United Student Aid Funds, Inc., a reinsurance corporation. USA funds did for student loans, on a lesser scale, what FHA insurance did for home mortgages. Any banker who lent to a college student at fair interest could have the loan endorsed, free, by USA funds. If the student defaulted or died, the fund repaid the banker.

The idea was sensible enough to require a few years of selling among bankers and educators. But by this fall, it had begun to pay off. The fund has reinsured $35 million worth of student loans in 4 years, and is now endorsing about that much more each year. Some 48,000 needy students in 674 colleges draw funds from 5,350 participating banks. Savings and loan associations will soon offer the same service. Result: Students will have access to more financial resources than would ever be supplied by the Government's direct loans. And just in time. The post-war litter of babies, now of age to invest in their college education, will test the capacity of all sectors—public, private, independent—to finance education.

What next? Methodical Dick Cornuelle, in picking his first national experiment, had passed over several other obvious needs, from a network of low-cost nursing homes to private slum clearance. He settled on education loans because he ran across a local scheme that would work everywhere. Massachusetts bankers had already proved out the basic idea. Cornuelle copied it nationwide in USA Funds. Looking back later, he suspected that he had stumbled on to both the critical strength and the weakness of his independent sector.

"For almost any social problem, somebody in the country has developed a solution that works," he guessed. "But the independent institutions aren't yet organized to find it and apply it nationwide."

Well, maybe, but nobody would believe it, Cornuelle knew, until somebody deliberately tested the independent sector on a huge, apparently unlickable chore. So, groping for the next move, he reached for bigger trouble. What? Early this year, the answer was obvious in every newspaper and magazine: automation unemployment. The Feds' poverty package would, through the Job Corps, reach only a few hundred thousands of the hard-core unemployed, but would expand unless the real problem could be solved. If our giant economy, mostly private, could not open up jobs for low-skill workers—school dropouts and automation layoffs—then unemployment would swell with the quickening tempo of technological change.

THOUSANDS OF WARS ON POVERTY

So began the second experiment. Cornuelle flew east to see another private reformer, a veteran out of USA Funds: Bennett Kline, executive vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers. The NAM, charged with "coal-black reaction" by more than one big businessman, had tried for years to change its "public image" without changing its working habits. Now, Kline saw the chance for NAM to earn a reputation for public service. Chairman William Brady and the NAM board agreed, though some rank-and-file members viewed such do-goodery with all the enthusiasm of the Baptist deacon who was asked to turn the parsonage into a house for call girls. Surely, they felt, somebody else ought to run this kind of service.

Throughout the summer days and nights, business leaders and the NAM staff turned from preaching free enterprise toward action to make it still better. The private planning sessions, which I attended when possible, settled on a strategy. If Cornuelle was right, many companies and communities must have found ways to help the jobless into jobs. Some of the techniques would work on a national scale. To find them, Kline fired off

26,000 questionnaires. Hundreds of responses poured back. Standard Oil of New Jersey had learned to spot the forgotten talents of men laid off, and help them into job-growth industries. Educators and employers in Bedford, Ohio, had collaborated to cut the high school dropout rate in half. Milwaukee's Manpower, Inc., had successfully test run a free placement service for unemployed teenagers.

Ben Kline bound the best local cases into a handbook for national distribution, persuaded other business associations to plan management seminars in major cities. Harvard Business School, the chamber of commerce, the National Industrial Conference Board and other groups pitched in.

"We have enough evidence to know that somebody has solved every kind of employment problem," Kline decided. "Now, we have to find out how to put these solutions into general use."

Will NAM make a dent? You and I will wait and see. If member executives have the managerial gift to follow through, several million Americans over the next few years will work more productively and in greater dignity. Business, of course, will benefit from more talented, mobile workers. Beyond lies the hidden reward. Those who take part in such a project will have found, as one man suggested, what they can do for their country.

"There should not be one war on poverty in America. There should be thousands," Cornuelle wrote. "Have we come to the point in America where the public business is left undone unless Government does it? I don't believe so."

But the Federal Government looks so big. Isn't it the only agency powerful enough, rich enough to do the big jobs? No. Quite the contrary. The general economy is so much bigger than the bureaucracy that a minor improvement in the Nation's use of low-skill workers, engineered by NAM or local communities, would help many more people than any Federal program in sight. Businessmen know it. Leaders like Chrysler president Lynn Townsend warn against "abdicating the problem-solving responsibility," but have lacked until now a clear strategy on which to act.

Some sense that the GOP ought to help. As far back as the midfifties, I found Chicago industrialist Charles Percy trying to put his party to work. He wanted to mobilize business and other private outfits. If the minds and talents outside Government could focus upon the future needs of America, then all our institutions, not just Government, could work more effectively to meet them. One night, he came back from Washington and talked until 3 a.m. about a session he'd had with President Eisenhower. Yes, he said, Ike understood and would set up a "Goals Committee" inside both the administration and the party. Instead of planning the future through Government, the Goalsmen would strive for general policy agreement upon goals, rely upon public and private leaders to make the decisions on how to reach them.

Percy's idea fizzled. Top scholars and business thinkers contributed to a dull book, and the GOP's 1960 platform concerned itself with such futuristic subjects as "Science and Technology." But the old pros, with the cynical vision of their trade, considered the effort a waste of time, perhaps a flirt with liberalism. Talk of science revives the suspicion, among demon-minded conservatives, that machines produce the sins of modernism. Besides, in the party's councils, even in its Senate caucuses, you could rile the animals more with another sermon against communism.

"That sterile stuff is all we hear at caucus anymore," said one GOP Senator. "They attack everybody, and work up a kind of meanness."

The Goals idea, however, suffered from a more serious weakness. It might have survived its critics if it had fomented action instead of talk. What it lacked was the practicality since developed in Cornuelle's experiments and thought.

Chuck Percy, I find, has come to a similar conclusion. After he lost his bid for the Illinois governorship—because he did not disavow Goldwater—he knew exactly what he wanted to do next. He worked for several days on Teamwork Foundation, Inc., a local outfit that teaches illiterates to read in 8 weeks. Then he went to the Businessmen for Good Government Committee, the 8,000-man mainstay of his campaign. He asked them to help him find jobs for Teamwork's new literates, and to take on other public service chores.

"A businessman's work for good government doesn't necesarily begin in politics," he believes. "It begins where the problems are. Our committee doesn't want to disband. We're going to take my campaign staff and turn it over to the Republican Party. We're going to develop positive programs, yes, and put them into practice."

Percy will, in short, rebuild the Illinois GOP machinery into a clearinghouse for action in the independent sector. Where legislation will help private institutions do better, the staff will draft suitable bills. Thus, the party will try to serve the State, lend a hand in dreary day-to-day toil, instead of just jumping up every 4 years to beg for votes. If the idea works, it may spread. Nine years ago, Percy invented a permanent, broad-based system for raising GOP funds. His Illinois plan has by now spread to 38 other States parties.

A GOP clearinghouse would, in many cities and States, merely stimulate a leadership net that already serves well, often in silent partnership with one or both parties. But on the national level, there's almost a vacuum. So the prospects are jucier. If the national committee appointed a British-style shadow cabinet, as some conservatives want, each "secretary" could concentrate upon independent and private activity in his department.

The shadow Labor Secretary could, for a start, hunt (like the NAM) for local solutions to unemployment, team with management and unions to put the best discoveries into national use. The shadow Commerce Secretary could take it from there, help businessmen and educators improve the retraining programs, that must come with automation job-jumping. Treasury's shadow, while debating fiscal policy, might seek tax encouragement for a much broader base of stock ownership. The shadow at the State Department might cheer on such projects as one now going in Latin America, where U.S. mortgage experts help Peace Corpsmen set up savings funds to build worker homes.

Cornuelle would go further. For decades, Congress has relied upon its ever alert General Accounting Office for a permanent staff to study the Federal bureaucracy, report its successes and failures. "Congress should set up the same kind of permanent staff to study the resources and workings of nongovernment agencies," Cornuelle now proposes. "Then when the executive branch comes up with another job for Government to do, there would be somebody to testify on what people are already doing and what would help them do it better. For the first time, we'd have clear competition with Government in public service. On many jobs, the independent sector could product better results at less cost."

This idea, like any other, turns silly when pushed beyond its useful limit. When I tried it on a horn-rimmed Harvard thinker, he instantly imagined a ladies' auxiliary trying to run a sewage system. "I guess if you asked the John Birch Society to work on the problem of the aged," mutters Cornuelle, "they'd solve it by killing them off."

Ironic though it may be, the radical conservatives who violently protest Federal activity do less than the moderates to offer the alternatives. In the rightwing alphabet agencies, from the JBS to ISI and YAF, many would rather nourish despair than cure it. Star performers on the rightwing lecture circuit, among them ex-Reds who have switched sides in their class warfare, make a profession of dramatizing dangers so terrible that only the Minuteman's rifle will stand them off.

Bill Buckley, the movement's overseer-intellectual, has matured a bit since we studied Plato together at Yale. He rejects as silly the Birch theory, "documented" in rigorous detail, that Communist conspiracy shapes almost every event. But he retains his boyish obsession for public sword practice upon the more pathetic oddities of the far left. Like them, he treats politics as total war between extremes, across a no man's land of muddled middlers. On the day before his candidate's defeat, his National Review Bulletin sounded the feverish theme with which conservatives scared voters more than the Senator did: "Counterrevolution—and that, really, is what Barry Goldwater is talking about—is a sweaty, brawly business."

In this frantic mood, radical conservatives have failed to notice, or often to admit, America's steady march toward a responsible brand of conservatism. The Democratic Party has spread across the middle, and in John F. Kennedy's tax-cut proposal took over the ground long occupied by business-minded Republican moderates (see "Eight Views of JFK," Look, November 17). The fighting liberal of old has almost vanished from politics. Even the new poverty package breaks with the custodial tradition of Federal welfare legislation. Poverty war strategy: Help unemployables off relief by education. The tactics: Hire companies to train workers for their business, make small grants to independent agencies like the Urban League to expand their need-tailored retraining.

Socialism—government takeover of production—is a dead notion. Free enterprise, though aided by subsidy and research technology, is no less pure than in days of land-grant railroading.

Almost unnoticed, the States have risen again. The Federal effort has expanded mainly in defense, while State and local governments have responded to citizen demand for better schools, mental care, recreation grounds. Federal taxing and spending, even debt, now decline sharply as a proportion of all governmental effort in the 50 States. More important, the private economy grows much faster than Federal bureaucracy. Washington just ain't as big a place as it used to be, though the Washington press corps can't yet admit its decline.

Nor, for other reasons, can the radical conservatives. Their intellectuals are only slowly emerging from the underground, a dark place. Their philosophical tradition, which liberal scholars tried to ignore, is strong on principle, but warped by political despair. To see how their individualistic themes may evolve, we can look at the experience of one individual, Richard Cornuelle.

A Navy veteran and Phi Beta Kappa student at California's Occidental College, he became impatient with "uncritical, unexamined liberalism." Then he heard about New York University's Ludwig von Mises, Austrian-born sire of the main-line conservative doctrine that treats individual freedom as the absolute moral imperative. Suddenly, von Mises had a new student and protege.

"I got converted to the hard, doctrinaire conservative position, and moved through a short right-wing anarchist period," says Cornuelle of his personal thought. "If you pursue the logic of the conservative doctrine, you get to anarchy. We used to be proud, in our all-night student sessions at Schrafft's Restaurant, that we weren't afraid to say so—to call ourselves anarchists."

He preached the pure doctrine as a professional propagandist for right-wing foundations. "Our theme was educate, educate, educate—and when you get an effective majority in the country, you sort of call a constitutional convention and straighten it all out." Dick and the other purists believed the United States was creeping far into socialism. The faster the better, they thought, for only in terror would voters panic into counterrevolution. The purists did not fight, as did Taft conservatives, to temper welfare legislation, or to improve nongovernment institutions. No, they aimed for "a choice not an echo," the day when they would spin this huge Nation right around and head back where, they thought, we came from.

Cornuelle, a practical American, was never comfortable with the commandmant of legal revolution from the right. But it bothered him less than the doctrine's permanent rejection of all public charity for the poor and the weak, "the hard cases" that invite socialistic measures. Son of a Presbyterian minister, Cornuelle faced "a growing conflict between a human motive out of church upbringing and the sense of comfort I had in this tidy theoretical position."

Friedrich von Hayek, conservative economist then at the University of Chicago, had watched European governments on "The Road to Serfdom." He put the issue bluntly to his true believers: "The defense of liberty can never rest on its ability to perform in any particular case." But the particular cases, young Cornuelle realized, were people. After writing the pure doctrine about the Kentucky coal fields—"the least able producers have disappeared"—he went to check on those least able producers. "They hadn't disappeared," he admitted painfully, as he saw the hungry men in the mountain towns. He began to suspect that his conservative heroes had been too long in the ivory tower.

He studied their work more intently, and as an officer of the Volker Fund subsidized a major increase in the publishing of their books. He aided most of the men who became Senator Goldwater's campaign brain trust, and still shares their belief in principle rather than accommodation.

UP FROM RADICALISM

But where they quit thinking, he kept going. The conflict between a liberal concern for humanity and a conservative respect for free-enterprise principle, Cornuelle saw, is a standard dilemma. "The opinion polls show it. People contradict themselves. They are against socialism, but vote for programs that they define as socialism. The liberals speak for our humane aspirations. The conservatives stress our desire to keep Government in check. If only the Government can solve modern social problems, the liberals and conservatives have no common ground. Political dialog grows bitter and empty. Debate cannot bring adjustment. Both sides must retreat to hard ideology."

Still devoted to conservative principle, Cornuelle resolved his dilemma only when he recognized that his cause need not rest its case on the profitmaking sector, where the invisible hand of the free market may come too late for human need. "Free enterprise isn't an all-purpose social system," he wrote. Nor can the traditional appeal to voluntary action be left as an excuse for irresponsibility. Using the fulcrum of the independent sector, he proved that individuals and groups can, if they organize their efforts better, make their personal concern effective and lighten the load on Government—how much, nobody yet knows.

Cornuelle has been startled, as have I, at the varieties of people reaching toward the same answer. In the colleges, political debate has lost ground to personalization, a student word for personal action on Negro rights, in slum work and the Peace Corps. In State governments and U.S. agencies, bright young men on tight budgets look for ways to stimulate private action, rather than take on a new job entirely with civil servants.

Their effort reflects the hidden wisdom of the country. In the Kentucky town of Russellville, lawyer-Rotarian Granville Clark thinks hard on the individual's responsibility to society. He drawls his beliefs calmly, and acts upon them. After the Supreme Court's decision on school integration, he personally led the citizen campaign to comply, and soon brought off one of the most peaceful, effective plans in the South. But he worries. He believes that this Nation, unable or unwilling to provide enough voluntary welfare, recognized a need for Federal action a generation ago. "We've Christianized the Federal Government." But he fears that the next generation, trained in the myth of Federal omnipotence, could lose its sense of "obligation to their fellow man." If so, even the liberal spirit that led to welfare programs would be cut off at its human roots.

To some extent, we've already seen the cutoff. The conservative movement in some regions turns into a revolt of the new rich, a selfish attack upon taxes or any other community claim upon a citizen's time or money. Some right-wing writers reject the ideal of love as an instrument of "the looters." Each year of rising prosperity creates millions more Americans who have, as a rich young man put it, "more to do with than they have to do for." The churches, the political parties, and independent institutions have failed to reach out to the moneyed newcomers and harness them into hard, rewarding service. They are left with only their new wealth, which came too quick to seem permanent, and with the Birch Society to feed their fear that it may be taken away.

One symptom is ominous: street violence. It has a peculiar fascination for the sensitized right. Why? It strikes where nobody feels responsible for the victim, the bystanders can turn their backs in mutual anonymity (see "Who Cares?" Look, September 3). It will not be cured by tough cops. It will only give way to treatment of its cause, which is the presence of social outcasts in communities where nobody—in or out of Government—can or will exercise personal concern for them.

In this situation, the argument over the Federal Government's size and role becomes irrevalent. If, as conservatives argue, a mighty Government program will not cure the community malady, the hands-off doctrine does not even admit its existence. Liberalism and radical conservatism end up in their customary stalemate. Unless both can reach down to deeper principle, and compromise on method, the country will merely listen to more debate upon their dilemma.

"If Republicans can resolve the differences between themselves," Cornuelle believes, "they can resolve a dilemma for the whole population."

And in the process, they can become a party with a mission. For decades after the Civil War, the GOP had, and held to, an instinctive vision of vast America's growth into a mighty industrial nation, and no amount of graft or scandal broke its monopoly. The Democrats, living in the memory of Jefferson's agrarian democracy, did not become dominant until the depression. Then they grasped the individual's need for protection against inhuman forces grown too big for one man to fight, or to leave to blind chance.

Today, the future belongs to the party that can provide the individual with something more: the opportunity, in liberty and abundance, to know that he matters.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the crisis in southeast Asia has perhaps deflected the attention of many of us from the equally grave crisis facing the United Nations. In this year, its 20th, it would be hard to imagine a world without the United Nations. An entire generation has lived with it. It is, in no small measure, responsible for the absence of major world conflicts which ravished the world in the first half of this century.

The United Nations today deserves the attention and assistance of the United States more than at any time since its inception.

An editorial published in the Bel Air (Md.) Aegis reflects the concern of many thoughtful Americans for the fate of this organization. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE UNITED NATIONS

With the unexpected cooperation of the Soviet Union the United Nations managed to survive its 19th session without a major calamity, but the prospects for the future look no rosier than ever before. The paths toward great goals, now as always, are filled with hidden traps and strewn with thorns.

Since its founding 20 years ago at the close of the Second World War, the U.N. has been sniped at from all parts of the globe with a variety of weapons ranging from pamphlets and circulars to live bazooka shells. In recent weeks, their target rendered more vulnerable by the Indonesian resignation and the Russian-French debt crisis, the sharpshooters have increased their fire.

To those who would have the United States withdraw from the U.N. and order its representatives from our shores, the international organization appears a sinister nest of conspiratorial foreigners and revolutionaries, most of them suspiciously darkskinned, whose only aims are to discover our secrets and squander our funds. But this conception of the situation rests on a hazy and distorted vision of today's world.

Only through the give-and-take of constructive debate in a properly recognized and sanctioned setting can the inevitable misunderstandings that arise in any intercourse between differing cultures be dispelled. The preservation of the U.N. is, from a practical standpoint, in the direct interest of the United States. To remove ourselves from the only existing forum for broad international discussion would be to become isolated, and in that isolation defenseless against the rising tides of communism and poverty. We could not long survive as a rich island in a sea of discontent.

There are great ethical and political arguments for continued American support of the United Nations, but the most compelling reason is supremely practical. The building by the East River, with its soaring tiers of windows, is more than a symbol of all that is enlightened and fine in man. It represents his last, best hope for the survival of his civilization.

BEL AIR, MD.,
February 27, 1965.

The EDITOR THE AEGIS,
Bel Air, Md.

DEAR SIR: I commend you for your editorial on the United Nations. I hope the many people who read the Aegis were moved by your words.

Citizens should write President Lyndon B. Johnson and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The President and the Senator should be told that decisions have been put off long enough in the United Nations; and

the United States should take a strong position and move toward making the U.N. the true voice of all the people in the world. It is up to us to make it into a parliament of men.

Yours truly,

MARY C. WOODWARD.

WEST COAST RELIEF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I welcomed the opportunity to cosponsor Senate bill 327. This worthy piece of proposed legislation, introduced by the two distinguished Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mrs. NEUBERGER], is designed to alleviate the effects of the disastrous floods of December and January, last. Recent estimates put the amount of damage done in the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Nevada at some $462 million.

As the Senate knows, my State of Alaska last spring was struck by a natural disaster of equivalent magnitude. Although the much more highly developed economies of the West Coast States have made less crippling the effects of the recent floods, the dollar amount of the damage done was roughly similar. In both cases, commercial insurance coverage paid for only a small amount of the loss.

Mr. President, the States of the West Coast have requested aid from the Federal Government if they are to recover from what has happened. This aid must be sufficient in amount to restore the damage done, and it must occur with some reasonable relationship in time to the events which gave rise to the need.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Public Works will give the West Coast disaster relief bill its early attention, and that we shall have it here on the floor for our consideration as quickly as we did the Alaska earthquake legislation of last summer.

DRUGS AND JUVENILES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a classic series of articles concerning the abuse of dangerous drugs written by a seasoned journalist, Ray Richards, and which appeared in the Boston Globe.

The alarming abuse of these drugs by juveniles and others in the Boston metropolitan area was so effectively brought to the attention of the public by William Davis Taylor, publisher of the Boston Globe, that it was a deciding factor in the judgment of Boston Police Commissioner Edmund L. McNamara to call a seminar for tomorrow, March 16, in that city, to present to public officials, deans of schools and colleges, social workers, and news media the "methods for preventing addiction and detecting the youthful" user of narcotics, marihuana, and dangerous drugs in its early stages.

Law enforcement in Boston is not alone in its confrontation with the havoc wrought on the community, family life, and law enforcement by the abuse of narcotics, dangerous drugs, and other chemical compounds which were designed for one purpose and used for another.

Both the Boston metropolitan police and the Boston Globe should be recognized for the public service they are performing in making the public aware of the threat the abuse of these drugs presents, particularly to the young people. This kind of public service makes President Johnson's war against crime in the streets much easier. And I would like to point out that the crime connected to the abuse of these drugs is a major contributor to the overall crime picture.

I regret that because of another commitment I will not be able to attend Police Commissioner McNamara's seminar in Boston tomorrow, but I consider it important enough to have a personal representative there.

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

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 17, 1965]

THE DRUG MENACE I: WHY KIDS TRY DOPE—A "BIG MAN" AT 12 WITH GOOFBALLS

(By Ray Richard)

Why do kids take dope?

Jimmy can tell you why.

He's only 12 years old, but he's done a lot of living for a boy his age. A lot of dying, too.

He died a thousand deaths a few weeks ago. He gulped down 12 "goofballs."

Then the pains came. He doubled up, fell to the floor of the living room, cried out for help, collapsed in his mother's arms.

She called police. They took him to the hospital where his stomach was pumped out, his life possibly saved.

"Why did you take them, Jimmy?" a social worker asked him later when the boy appeared in Boston juvenile court.

"A kid up the street had 'em. He said it was a new kind of candy. Asked me and a couple of other kids if we wanted to try some. I took a couple, then a couple more, and then I felt funny so I went home and got sick."

This was not a grilling. This was a man-to-man talk about a man-sized problem.

The youngster we're calling "Jimmy" sat up straight in the chair, erect but not tense. He didn't act like a wise guy. He tugged now and then at the sleeves of his bright red sweater but never took his glance from the man across the desk.

He was answering questions from Louis G. Maglio, executive director of the citizenship training program of the Boston juvenile court. Since 1936 the program has been a rehabilitation center for juveniles. Instead of sentencing some delinquents to jail, the court requires them to report daily, after school, to Maglio's downtown Boston facilities for guidance instead of punishment.

"The kid up the street, where did he get them?" Maglio asked.

"We went into his mother's bedroom. He found a bandage box in a drawer. The candy was in the box."

"You thought they were candy, Jimmy?" Maglio asked softly.

"Yes, sir." Jimmy never blinked.

Maglio took a vial of white pills from a drawer and showed them to Jimmy. They were similar to the pills which had been taken from the boy's stomach.

"Do you know what these are?" he asked.

"They look like the candy I had."

Maglio took another tack. "Do you know what dope is, Jimmy?"

"Yes, sir. I've seen it around the corner. Lots of teenagers take it. They have it with ginger ale."

"Why do they take it, Jimmy?"

"They make you high. You have a lot of fun. They make you yell and scream and throw bottles. You take some and in 2 hours you're not walking, you're crawling. It makes you a big man."

"Does it really make you a big man, Jimmy?"

"They think so."

"Would you be willing to take a chance on your life with dope so other kids will think you're a big man?" asked Maglio.

"I'm not, but some of the kids are," the boy replied.

HOLD ON YOUNG

This willingness to risk life itself so they will be considered "big men" is the chief reason why boys and girls get started on the drug habit, in the opinion of many experts consulted by the Globe.

"One of the most deplorable results of the illicit narcotics traffic is the hold that it has upon teenagers," the New York Police Department reported in a recent U.S. investigation of dope.

"The adult makes an introduction to the vice an act entirely of his own volition. However, in most cases this is not so with teenagers; and the reasons for this is that they are teenagers. It is not difficult to imagine a youngster being dared to try the stuff by his pals. Not wanting to be 'chicken,' he does. He then feels he is a 'man' in the eyes of his cronies, for it is axiomatic of youth to emulate adulthood. Thus the lad is proud of what he has done.

"Many a youthful life is shortened because of a wrong turn made during these vital years that sometimes are called the vacuum between childhood and adulthood.

SOME WANT RELIEF

Adults abuse drugs, too, but for other reasons.

Some want "relief" from the monotony of their jobs or their lives, like housewives.

Others—such as musicians, actors, doctors, truck drivers, executives—resort to it to relieve fatigue after a tension-filled day or night.

Some take dope out of frustration with their lot in life and resentment of the society they say caused it.

Some are accidental victims of dope, because they first took narcotics to relieve pain during medical treatment.

Some take drugs to remain awake. Truck drivers fighting tight schedules and college students cramming for exams are in this group.

It's called "academic readiness" on campus.

Other college students get started on dope for what they call "intellectual experimentation."

WHAT'S AN ADDICT?

But regardless of age or how he got started, a drug addict is anyone who takes harmful drugs:

1. In amounts sufficient to create a hazard to this own health or to the safety of the community, or

2. After obtaining them through illicit channels, or

3. On his own initiative rather than on professional advice.

This is the definition set down a year ago by the President's Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse.

And, regardless of age, anyone who takes drugs excessively for any reason, except those accidentally hooked, have a personality defect, the Globe was told.

ABUSES SPREADING ALL OVER STATE

The abuse of drugs has become a major social, medical, and legal problem throughout the country. It is growing nationally, in Massachusetts, maybe in the city or town where you live.

It is an "absolute epidemic," says a U.S. Senate committee.

It is an "American tragedy," says Senator THOMAS DODD of Connecticut.

It is all over Massachusetts say social workers, educators, police.

Suburban housewives abusing tranquilizers, teenagers drinking cough medicine, addicts shooting heroin are elements of the same problem.

Here are some insights into the drug menace:

More pep pills and barbiturates are sold illegally in the United States than are sold legally.

The abuse of drugs is causing highway accidents, school dropouts, and many crimes in Massachusetts.

The problem is striking every economic bracket, from slums to suburbia, and every age bracket, from infants to golden agers.

It may be spreading faster in the suburbs than in the cities.

Thousands of forged prescriptions for narcotics are passed every year.

The abuse of pep pills, diet pills, sleeping pills, and tranquilizers potentially is as harmful to the person and the community as are opium, morphine, and heroin.

Marihuana is being smoked on many college campuses, in most cities and in many towns.

Abuse of drugs is fascinating teenagers just as smoking, drinking, and sex parties have.

More than 5 billion pep pills alone get into the illicit market every year.

Confusion, chaos, and controversy hamper attempts to find a cure for addiction.

"Drug abuse today involves not only the narcotic drugs and marihuana, but to an increasingly alarming extent other drugs such as the barbiturates, the amphetamines (pep pills) and even certain tranquilizers," reported the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse.

MAFIA MOVES IN

The Mafia, long connected with the international marketing of opium, morphine, and heroin, has opened up the illicit market for drugs.

Drug abuse is crashing cars, smashing lives, and wrecking families throughout the State.

Last November 17, a 7-pound, 6-ounce baby boy was born in a Boston hospital. It had curly black hair and brown eyes. It was born a dope addict.

An 85-year-old man roams about Greater Boston daily, seeking morphine or marihuana. He has been a dope addict for 50 years.

For 2 years a firetruck has been driven in a North Shore community by a firefighter addicted to cough medicine.

Many drug abusers don't realize they are addicts. For "kicks," to "escape" or for other reasons, they—

1. Drink or inject paregoric, a medicine used to relieve diarrhea and soothe baby's gums;

2. Break open benzedrine-based nasal inhalers and chew the wicks or dunk them in hot tea or coffee;

3. Drink codeine-based cough medicine by the bottle;

4. Go to incredible extremes to satisfy their urge for drugs.

NOT WHOLE STORY

Statistics do not tell the story. The only cases which make up statistics on drug abuse or addiction are cases known and reported. They involve only persons caught. But for every case known and recorded, there are vast numbers of cases undetected.

With most crimes there is a victim to tell the police. Not so with the transfer of drugs illicitly. Such transfers are willing exchanges; there is nobody to report the crime.

Drug abuse is like an iceberg, and most of the problem is hidden in a sea of human misery. By knowing how much iceberg is above the water, geologists can tell how much is beneath. But nobody can measure the amount of drug abuse hidden.

The medical and legal professions, the drug industry, educators, sociologists, enforcement officials are determined to stop the abuse. The goals are clear, but the paths to those objectives are obscured by controversy and lack of facts.

Much can be done, however, by these groups, by the legislature, by the community, by parents—and by drug abusers themselves.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 18, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—II: TEEN ADDICTION HIGH IN EAST BOSTON

(This is the second in an in-depth series by Globe Reporter Ray Richard concerning the growing problem of narcotics among teenagers in the Nation.)

(By Ray Richard)

Georgie took pills three nights last week. He would start about 7 o'clock, get five goof balls down by 8, staggering by 8:30 and wild by 10.

Three times he got into fights with other kids on pills. And three times he had his nose broken. But he still takes the pills.

Georgie is one of many teenagers addicted to drugs in east Boston. Estimates range from 1,000, by a father of a dope addict, to several hundred by police.

The problem breaks out in pockets. It is usually around Day Square. The word is spread, There is pills around. A few youths vanish, come back later in cars, their pockets containing pills. They spread them around and scores of youths get high.

The police arrest a pusher. The pharmacists spot a phony prescription and flash the word to other druggists to be on the alert.

The pills become hard to get, and the wave of drug abuses recedes.

But the problem remains in east Boston, as it does in many other communities in Massachusetts, if sometimes dormant.

The problem is all over the State. In nearly every city and town there probably is some of it, if only one isolated case, declares Capt. John Moriarty, who until last week headed the Massachusetts State Police Narcotics Squad.

Except in the rural communities, he adds.

In Marlboro several years ago, the local police teamed with inspectors from the drug control section of the State department of public health and State police to smash a ring of 25 youths habitually getting high on drugs.

You get a pocket and it branches out into other towns and cities because the kids have access to cars, points out Joseph T. Conley, narcotic consultant to the Massachusetts State Police.

The outbreak in Marlboro snared youths from Framingham, Hudson and other neighboring communities.

When a pocket breaks out in East Boston, the pills—and their abuse—is liable to show up in Winthrop, Revere, Chelsea and as far away as Lynn.

The State department of public health recorded narcotic addicts living in 48 Bay State communities last year. These were users of opium, cocaine, morphine or heroin who had been caught.

It also lists 72 communities which reported intoxication or poisoning from harmful drugs, which cannot be sold legally without a prescription.

Eighty percent of the problem in Massachusetts is in Boston, in the estimation of George A. Michael, director of the food and drugs division of the department of public health.

"Boston has a problem and it's getting worse," says the Federal Food and Drug division in Washington. "Every big city has a problem. If you want to get out and look for it, you can find it. And each year it is getting worse because the stuff is easy to get."

The U.S. Senate subcommittee investigating the problem nationally reports: "There is no doubt it is a problem in Massachusetts, particularly in the Boston area.

"Boston has all of the population characteristics which cultivate a problem in harmful drugs. There are artists, musicians, many college students, all groups which are prone to drug abuse, and an abundance of doctors and hospitals which have legal access to drugs."

Capt. Jeremiah Sullivan of the Boston police vice and narcotics squad says emphatically, "There is no question it has increased in Boston in recent years."

Louis G. Maglio, executive director of the Citizenship Training Center for juveniles, a rehabilitation center for Boston Juvenile Court, says the abuse of drugs is increasing in Massachusetts, particularly among juveniles.

"We are 6 or 7 years behind New York, which really has it bad," Maglio says. "We were the same time behind with the problem of teenagers and alcohol. The drug problem is increasing and we really are worried about it."

He based his estimates on reports of former clients of the center who repeatedly drop in for unrequired visits, and an increased number of queries about the problem from parents.

He sees harmful drugs a potential menace to every community. From a recent month-long tour of 60 cities and towns to gage the juvenile delinquency problem he concludes delinquency in all forms, including the abuse of drugs, is making a distinct gain in the so-called better communities.

Bostonians took cognizance of the dope problem last November when the city council, at the urging of Councilor Fred C. Langone, adopted a resolution asking Mayor Collins to call a citywide conference to discuss ways to beef up the fight against narcotics, drugs and all forms of dope.

"The problem in some sections of the city is so great." Langone told the council, "that community leaders have had meetings and tried to suppress the use of these so-called goof balls and other harmful drugs." But the efforts of these civic leaders, and increased police efforts when an outbreak of dope occurs, have not been enough to lick the problem.

Consequently, Langone said, "We have young high school children, and that is about all they are, stealing and breaking into houses, and stealing automobiles so they can get money to buy the particular drugs they have become addicted to."

"Don't imply that dope is on every street corner," one social worker urged, "or that every teenager who goes out at night is confronted with it."

Dope is not on every street corner. And every teenager who goes out at night isn't confronted with it. But most people of any age who want dope can find it, or know somebody else who will get it for them.

CASES OF INTOXICATION, POISONING

The following Massachusetts communities reported intoxication or poisoning by harmful drugs in 1964:

Acushnet, Andover, Arlington, Bass River, Belmont, Bridgewater, Braintree, Brookline, Brockton, Cambridge, Concord, Chatham, Chathamsport, Chelmsford, Chelsea, Cohasset, Dedham, Dracut, Dorchester, Edgartown, East Bridgewater, East Templeton, Everett, Fall River, Framingham, Franklin, Georgetown, Gloucester, Greenfield, Groton, Groveland, Halifax, Haverhill, Bingham, Lee, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, Malden, Marshfield, Medford, Milton, Marblehead, Newton, New Bedford, Needham, North Chatham, North Chelmsford, North Attleboro, Oakham, Pembroke, Quincy, Raynham, Randolph, Revere, Rockland, South Chelmsford, Scituate, Somerset, Stoughton, Sudbury, Tewksbury,

Tyngsboro, Vineyard Haven, West Roxbury, Wilmington, Winthrop, Woburn and Worcester.

WHERE ADDICTS LIVE

The drugs control section of the department of public health reports narcotic addicts living in these communities in 1964:

Abington, Andover, Ayer, Brighton, Cambridge, Charlestown, Chelsea, Danvers, Dorchester, East Boston, Falmouth, Fairhaven, Framingham, Fitchburg, Holyoke, Jamaica Plain, Kingston, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, Marshfield, Medford, Methuen, Milton, Needham, New Bedford, Newton, Northampton, Norton, Pittsfield, Quincy, Revere, Roslindale, Roxbury, Salem, Saugus, Somerville, South Hadley, Springfield, Taunton, Waban, Waltham, Watertown, Webster, Weymouth, Winchendon and Worcester.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 19, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—III: NARCOTICS EASY TO BUY

(This is the third in an in-depth series by Globe Reporter Ray Richard concerning the growing problem of narcotics and other potentially harmful drugs among the teenagers in the Nation.)

(By Ray Richard)

Drugs are powerful friends. They are responsible for many of the great advances made by medicine in the past century. They have helped lower the death rate of infants, increase the life expectancy of people of all ages, and relieve pain and misery.

But when misused, they can become enemies of those who misuse them and of the community which permits them to be misused.

Laws constantly are being adjusted to make these vital medications available under professional supervision to the greatest number of persons who need them, but unavailable to those who would misuse them.

Consequently, some forms of dope can be purchased easily, if legally, in Massachusetts.

Not opium or cocaine. Few addicts use them any more.

Not heroin or morphine. Vigorous law enforcement activity, particularly around Boston, make them difficult to find.

Marihuana? It's reported to be prevalent on some college campuses and in many sections of the State but in order to buy it you must know a user or pusher or be an undercover agent for one of the enforcement agencies.

But dope in some other forms can be bought almost as conveniently as aspirin. These are the "exempt narcotics," such as cough medicine, which combine with the true narcotics, and with preparations called by law harmful drugs to make up the national dope problem.

And there are over-the-counter products, such as benzedrine-based nasal inhalers and model airplane glue.

Some drug addicts:

1. Drink cough medicine, bottles at a time, for its codeine.

2. Drink paregoric, for its opium.

3. Boil down paregoric and, with a broken-edge eye-dropper, inject the residue into their bloodstream.

4. Inhale the fumes from airplane glue.

5. Break open the benezedrine inhalers and chew the wicks or dunk them in hot coffee.

The cough medicines and paregoric, the glue and the inhalers can be bought in Massachusetts without a prescription. To buy the cough medicines and paregoric, you register your name and address with the pharmacist selling it. These are exempt narcotics which means they are preparations containing a narcotic and exempted from the stringent laws regulating the sale of narcotics.

The true narcotics can be sold only under a special narcotics prescription.

The exempt narcotics can be sold legally only in limited quantities. For example, no more than 4 ounces of an exempt cough medicine can be sold to a person within any 24 hours. And no more than an ounce of paregoric * * * "pep pills" and produce effects opposite to those caused by barbiturates. When improperly used they tend to create reckless behavior. They have many useful medicinal uses, however, such as reducing appetites. Many are prescribed, therefore, as diet pills. Brand names include Benzedrine and Dexedrine.

The barbiturates and amphetamines, when taken in excess or without doctor's instructions or permission, are highly dangerous. Mix them with wine, coffee, paregoric or each other, as some drug abusers do, and they can produce uncontrollable, unpredictable human behavior.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 20, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—IV: WHEN YOUR SON IS AN ADDICT

(In the several weeks he spent investigating the narcotics problem in Boston, Globe Reporter Ray Richard came across this story of family misfortune.)

(By the father of a drug addict as told to Ray Richard)

My son is a drug addict. Like most of them, he started out on cough medicine. The kind he started with they took off the market. Too many kids were buying it.

Then he turned to barbiturates. They are sedatives. They call 'em pep pills. If your kid is on them you've got a problem on your hands. A big problem.

If he takes them, you can tell right away. As soon as he walks in the door, his tongue will give him away.

He may be the wisest kid on the street, but he'll try to be very polite. He'll stagger and try to make you think he's been drinking. He'll talk like he's tonguetied. His tongue will be like a big lump in his mouth, and his lips will be crooked.

You'll notice his tongue is just like a piece of dead weight in his mouth. He can't talk. He'll mumble "Yes, sir. No, sir."

You say to him, what have you been doing? and he'll say, "Oh, I been drinking. I been drinking. Beer. Beer. Smell. Smell my breath."

That'll be the first thing they'll say to you, to throw you off. If you mention dope or act mad, he'll get all riled up.

Then he'll go after you.

He'll fight you. If you're his father, his brother, his sister * * * he'll go right at you. All the way. He'll fight the whole family. Hit his own mother, hit his own father. He'll lose his head, go wild.

He'll look for a knife or a gun or a club. They'll always look for an instrument because they know that all you've got to do is rush them and they'll go down. But they're strong.

You're gonna have to use force to restrain them. You're gonna have to give him a couple of punches in the stomach. It's the only way he'll feel it. You hit him in the stomach and he'll double right up.

Once you get him down, you'll have him under control. Then get him into bed. He'll sleep. Right away he'll sleep.

But you should never forget, as long as they are under the influence of these drugs they'll remember what you did and try to get you later.

If you hit him, he'll hit you later. He'll get you if he's still on the stuff.

When they come off the stuff it's a pitiful thing. If they've had enough, or are hooked, they'll get the horrors. My kid had the horrors. He's in jail now and he's so scared of getting the horrors he won't take anything, not even aspirin.

You get the horrors coming off drugs. They call it withdrawal. The last time, my boy had the horrors for 8 days. And he remembers every bit of it * * * every minute.

It's horrible to watch, to see your son go through this. They see the walls cracking and people chasing them and elephants walking through the doors and stuff like that.

They scream at the top of the lungs, "They're trying to get me."

They think they are dodging bullets and dodging mice. They feel pain, feel a knife sticking into them.

Even if they aren't yet hooked, if they've taken an overdose you've still got a bad problem on your hands. When they wake up they probably will be off it. And then it's a pitiful thing to see.

You'll see them crying and wonder what they've done to their father, their mother. They'll remember hitting their mother, their father. And they'll feel remorse. They'll cry. They won't know how to make up to you. If they don't remember, all you'll have to do is remind them. But they'll never admit it was drugs. They'll say "I'm sorry, but I was drinking and I didn't know what I was doing."

They'll be like Jekyll and Hyde. When they're under the drugs they'll be one type, when they're off it they'll be their regular selves.

This is what prevents you from hating him, because you know that he didn't realize what he was doing. And, after all, he still is your son.

If your boy gets hooked, when he gets off them it's a different thing. When they get up they'll be cocky and tough. But they'll live in fear.

He'll be wondering who he's hurt, who's going to have reprisals against him. And it gets so * * * I'll tell you how bad it gets * * * it gets so that when people get to know you, and how vicious you are, the sight of you will scare them.

You'll walk up to somebody's house that you know well, and they know that you're the person who's been taking the drugs, and they know your habits, and they'll slam the door and start screaming. They don't want you to come in. They won't know whether you are under it or not. And they'll fear you.

How can you help your son?

If you get mad, it ain't going to help. You try to talk to him, tell what happened, what becomes of these people who take dope, what they turn out to be, that their life is ruined, that once they get the reputation that they're drug addicts they can't get a job, no girl will marry them, nobody will go out with them, they're just an outcast.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 21, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—V: BEST WAY TO STOP TEENS—TELL THEM ALL ABOUT DRUGS

(The best weapon for combating the narcotics problem is the subject of this installment, based on information gathered by Globe Reporter Ray Richard from experts and addicts.)

(By Ray Richard)

"It's like you and me jumping off the Mystic River Bridge. I jump first. Then you jump."

This is a dope addict talking.

"As we fall toward the water, you look down at me. And you say to yourself, 'Boy. That poor guy's in a bad way. He can't save himself now. I'm glad I'm not bad off like him'."

Don't fool yourself, is the message. If you now are taking excessive doses of any drugs which make you "high" or allow you to "escape" from your problems, you are like the second fellow who jumps off the bridge. You have started your fall. You haven't fallen

as far as the fellow addicted to dope, but you are headed in the same direction and there is no way you can stop your fall.

As he unfolded this allegory, the addict recalled his own fall, how he had started on his way down by taking pep pills 8 years ago while working around a racetrack, and this habit progressed to marihuana when he became a musician, and then to heroin, which addicted him.

This addict lives within 5 miles of the statehouse. He has an attractive, intelligent wife, five handsome children, a spotless home, and a mother with a broken heart. And twice each day he slides a hypodermic needle into a vein and injects a dose of morphine, paregoric, or other form of dope. His will and his body crave these shots, and for his addiction there may be no cure.

His allegory is not airtight. Every person who habitually takes sleeping pills, pep pills, cough medicines or others of the potentially dangerous drugs is not necessarily condemned, he is not positively headed toward marihuana and on to the addicting drugs such as heroin and morphine. Some are and some aren't.

Some persons, even though they have "leaped off the bridge" by already abusing drugs of various kinds, can get themselves off the habit * * * if they don't wait too long. Informing them of the dangers inherent in abuse of drugs might shock them into stopping the habit. And telling others about the dangers which can result from the abuse of drugs can motivate the community to pass laws and take other unified action against the whole problem of dope.

"A critical need exists for an extensive and enlightened educational effort on drug abuse," reported the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse in 1963.

"The problem is still clouded by misconceptions and misinformation" which range all the way from "the notion that a single dose of heroin can cause addiction to the equally erroneous notion that once a person becomes addicted to narcotics he is beyond all hope of rehabilitation," the report said.

It said the public has not "grasped the magnitude of the economic and social burden imposed by those who use drugs. Millions of dollars in property are stolen each day, and there are the additional costs of law enforcement and of health and welfare services."

It recommended an "enlightened educational campaign" for professional personnel and the public. And it assailed the warning issued by some social workers, educators, and psychiatrists that revealing information about drugs might encourage persons, particularly teenagers, to be fascinated enough to try it.

"When the Commission speaks of the education of the teenager, it is addressing itself to prevention," the report read. "An educational program focused on the teenager is the sine qua non (an indispensable condition) of any program to solve the social problem of drug abuse.

"The teenager should be made conscious of the full range of harmful effects, physical and psychological, that narcotic and dangerous drugs can produce. He should be made aware that although the use of a drug may be a temporary means of escape from the world about him, in the long run these drugs will destroy him and all that he aspires to.

"It said the Commission rejects the view that education can lead the teenager to experimentation.

"Drug abuse is contagious in the social sense of the word, and most abusers of drugs are introduced to drugs by other users. The Commission feels the real question is not whether the teenager should be educated, but who should educate him? Should it be the street corner addict, or should it be the schools, churches, and the community organizations?

It concluded that education "is the best weapon in the long run."

One of the most essential facts to get across to the public, declared a panel at the White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, convened in 1962 by President Kennedy, is that "the drug abuse problem extends beyond narcotics and now encompasses the barbiturates and amphetamines and the list is likely to grow."

And, say many authorities on the problem, although starting off with cough medicine, pep pills, and goof balls may not lead to marihuana and heroin, the harmful drug habit sometimes is as disastrous as narcotic addiction itself.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 22, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—VI: DRUG SMOKING SPREADS ON CAMPUSES, BUT IT'S HARD TO UNCOVER

(The story of the dope problem on college campuses in this area is told in this installment through interviews with administrators and students.)

There are signs that marihuana is becoming more prevalent on college campuses. But, like most aspects of the dope problem, specific examples are hard to uncover.

Like abortions, speeding, and cheating on income tax returns, for every person caught there is an unknown number getting away with it.

On many New England campuses, students freely discuss it. But administrators generally know less about it than they wish because, as Kermit C. Morrissey, dean of students at Brandeis explained:

"The subculture of the students keep the information out of administrative channels. The full extent can be nothing more than a vague guess, even by the best informed administrators.

"Anyone who remembers the ingenuity of his own adolescence realizes how such information can be kept away from administrators," he said. "This inability to determine how extensive it is, is due not to a lack of interest or concern, but to lack of information."

At Brandeis seven students were arrested on marihuana charges last year. Morrissey said it usually is smoked, "not in order to achieve academic readiness for exams, but due to avant gardism. In every student body there are nonconformists."

Some students take it for "intellectual experiment," Morrissey continued. "They rationalize. But they take a different position when they get tripped up by it."

At Boston University, Dean of Students Staton R. Curtis says, "The problem of the use of narcotics on college campuses is a sufficiently recurring problem as to give real concern" to administrators.

"Great pressures are exerted on students. They are going to find many outlets and I look for more of this sort of thing rather than less," he said.

Dr. Graham Blane, Jr., chief of psychiatric services at Harvard, says, "We do not have a drug problem here at Harvard. Everything that can be done to discourage the use of drugs is being carried out and, in my opinion, most effectively."

"Some students use 'pep pills' to cram for exams," he said. "If they take them for this reason, and not for 'kicks,' " he added, "there is no difference morally than taking coffee or soft drinks for the same purpose."

But the Globe got a different response from Harvard students.

Asked how many Harvard students will try marihuana during college the students gave estimates ranging from 1 in 5—or 1,000 out of the student body of 5,000—to 1 in 100. It usually is sold to the students by Cambridge residents, or "townies," these students said.

A University of Massachusetts student told the Globe there are 150 users of marihuana on that campus.

"At the University of Massachusetts the users treat the stuff much as most others treat alcohol. They're more sophisticated about it. There's no pressure on anyone to try it. If they like it, they'll use it. That's all."

But the dean of students at the University of Massachusetts, William F. Field, scoffs at this estimate. "I don't see how anybody could give you any set figure, even an estimate, and be serious.

"In the first place, I doubt that your informant knows 150 people firsthand. He may know a dozen who may claim to know another 10 each. In terms of number, I personally feel that it is a relatively minor problem."

This week Capt. Jeremiah Sullivan of the Boston Police vice and narcotics squad attended in Albany, N.Y., the "Institute for the Prevention of Narcotics Addiction in College Students."

It drew officials from 100 colleges, along with enforcement officers. College officials were there from West Point, Bennington, colleges of every size. The turnout indicated a real interest in the problem by college heads.

The officials showed a genuine desire to be prepared to attack the dope problem should it break out on their campus.

Brandeis already has instituted preventive measures. At the start of each academic year it provides each student with information of the dangers of marihuana and other drugs.

"University administrators have the responsibility to provide information about the uncertainty of what marihuana can do," says Dean Morrissey.

"The position of the administrators has to be made clear, particularly when the action of the student is in violation of human law."

The rumbles around the college about marihuana are not roars. But they indicate the problem is there, if underground.

"Where there are repeated and widespread rumors of drugs being used," he observed, "there is very likely to be protracted use of a variety of drugs. When they are present, the word fans out. Where there are vague references to it, you can be pretty sure some reality is underneath it."

Boston College authorities say there is no marihuana problem there and the use of pep pills is "very small." To keep awake for studying, caffein derivatives are sometimes used.

Marihuana is not addicting in the true sense. No physiological craving is established by smoking it. But it can be habit forming and create a desire to try the addictive drugs.

The Justice Department of California issues this warning: "The user of marihuana is a dangerous individual and should definitely not be underestimated by police.

"Caution should be used at all times in taking any user of either cocaine or marihuana into custody, but particularly the known users of either cocaine or marijuana. They may be dangerous, hard to handle, and resort to violence."

Add theologians at Boston College "Anything that is harmful to one's self is morally unacceptable." Including marihuana.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 23, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—VII: PILLS CAUSE DANGEROUS BEHAVIOR

(By Ray Richard)

The growing abuse of nonnarcotic drugs, including barbiturates and amphetamines,

"is increasing problems of abnormal and social behavior, highway accidents, juvenile delinquency, and broken homes," President Kennedy told the White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse.

Examples:

A stolen car roared through a Boston suburb. A teenager was at the wheel. Police took up the chase. The stolen car struck a parked auto, then another, and another and another.

"He hit 12 parked cars," Lt. James Herrick of the State police narcotics squad said. "He was on pills. He said he didn't even realize he was being chased."

A Boston policeman recalls, "Six kids were in a car. They were mixing pills with beer and wine. A kid 17 years old assaulted one of the others with a small knife. Stabbed him four times in the arm, once an inch below the heart. One inch higher and it would have been murder."

Det. Robert J. Fawcett, of East Boston says, "We pulled a kid out of a wreck only a few weeks ago. He'd hit a tree. There were bennies all over the floor."

Outside of New England there are other examples:

On July 19, 1963, an auto carrying an Air Force sergeant, his wife, his 6-year-old son and an 8-year-old daughter approached a checkpoint set up for a highway survey near Tipton, Iowa.

The car stopped behind a truck. Moments later a tractor-trailer crashed into the rear of the car and drove it under the truck in front. It burst into flames, and all members of the family died. The driver of the trailer truck wasn't injured.

"Three bottles of amphetamine drugs were found in his suitcase," George P. Larrick, Commissioner of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, testified in August before a Senate subcommittee on health.

"He later admitted purchasing and using drugs during the trip. Blood tests proved that he was under the influence at the time of the accident."

In Houston, Tex., an ex-convict shot and killed a schoolteacher, assaulted a 14-year-old farm girl, and committed two robberies while under the influence of amphetamines.

The chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, told the 1963 national convention of the American Legion, "In all classes of American youth, and in all sections of the country, the habitual use of dangerous drugs is on the increase."

The abusers of drugs sometimes commit crimes when under the influence of the drugs, but they also often commit crimes to get their drugs.

They break into drugstores, often more interested in the narcotics than the money. Narcotic supplies were taken in recent breaks in pharmacies in Plainville and Longmeadow.

Last month in Wellesley two men, wearing stocking masks and carrying guns, tied Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Ward with sheets and robbed Ward's drugstore on Washington Street of $125 in cash and narcotics.

Doctors are often robbed of their bags containing narcotics.

Drug abusers of all ages commit crimes to get the instruments sometimes needed to administer drugs..

Boys between 15 and 17 years old twice have broken into an East Boston company which makes hypodermic needles. In the spring of 1963, three youths were charged with the break. Last summer two youths, ages 16 and 17, were charged with stealing 2,000 needles.

"We found some of them hidden on a rafter under a pier," Fawcett said. "When the tide came in, the water prevented you from getting at them, but they were high enough so the water didn't touch them."

Such needles are an expensive item on the drug black market.

Crimes of much greater magnitude also are committed for drugs.

The Food and Drug Administration, trying to find out how many barbiturates and amphetamine pills were getting into the illicit market, instituted a survey of all known manufacturers, brokers, and distributors of basic amphetamine and similar stimulants and of barbiturate chemicals. Some records of manufacturers were incomplete, and two of the Nation's largest pharmaceutical manufacturers declined to provide information about their production.

Even so, the survey showed that enough basic material was produced that year, 1962, to make nearly 5 billion 10-milligram pep pills and nearly 5 billion quarter-grain barbiturate capsules.

Consequently, Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, testified before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last February 24, "In view of the tremendous quantities of these drugs which FDA has found in illegal channels, it is estimated that no more than half of such drugs produced annually are sold legally. Drugs are being peddled by operators whose activities cover many States and whose operations involve hundreds of thousands, and even millions, of tablets."

A spokesman for the enforcement division of the FDA said, "The number of peddlers has increased. The underworld got into the business because there is so much money in it. They saw how much money there is in narcotics and didn't want any competition from the harmful drug traffic. We have a specific example of gangsters being in command."

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 24, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—VIII: PRESCRIPTIONS ARE FORGED

(This is the eighth in an in-depth series concerning the growing problem of narcotics among teenagers in the Nation.)

(By Ray Richard)

Some of the best amateur acting of our time is taking place in doctors' offices and in hospital emergency rooms by drug addicts tricking doctors and nurses out of prescription blanks to be forged for narcotics.

Two youths will enter a doctor's waiting room. One will claim he is dizzy or mention some vague disturbance. The doctor will take him into his inner office and close the door to the waiting room.

The youth in the waiting room fakes a pain and drops to the floor, moaning. The receptionist summons the doctor, who hurries out of his inner office to help the youth on the floor.

While the doctor is in the waiting room, the boy in the inner office alone will be grabbing any prescription pads he can find.

Some addicts give it a more subtle touch. They take only the top 20 or so prescriptions off the pads to diminish the chance the theft will be detected before they leave the office.

The theft of prescription blanks, the forging of them with prescriptions for narcotics and the passing of them to unsuspecting careless, indifferent or wrongfully cooperative pharmacists is one of the chief methods of obtaining drugs illegally in Boston and throughout the Nation.

That is why the Federal Bureau of Narcotics urges doctors: "Don't leave prescription pads around."

Young men who couldn't pass freshman Latin make out prescriptions for narcotics in perfect technical language. They use with precision the symbols of the medical profession, know the correct amounts to prescribe and can duplicate with flawless exactness the signature of a physician.

And perfection is a must in forging a script. Errors in spelling, in quantities specified or mixtures would easily be detected by the pharmacist.

Revere police have a doctor's reference book stolen by a youth from a doctor's office. The book lists brand names manufacturers give their preparations and is virtually a guidebook on harmful drugs.

"The addict we took it from was then 19 years old," explained Lt. George Hurley of the Revere Police Department. "He was a master at making out phony scripts."

The youth would make out a false prescription for pills and try to pass it at a drugstore. If every druggist he tried rejected him, he'd refer to the book for the brand name of an equivalent pill produced by another firm. Then he'd try another route of drugstores to see if the new script would work.

In the book the addict had penciled many notations and had written model prescriptions for many kinds of drugs.

Another prescription forger was a Latin school graduate.

"He'd write out the prescriptions in perfect Latin with no trouble at all," said Det. Robert J. Fawcett of East Boston. "He'd usually sell the prescriptions to other drug abusers for $1 each, plus one-half of the pills prescribed."

Once a dope user has acquired a prescription blank, written out the prescription and forged a doctor's name he then uses another set of ruses in an effort to outsmart the pharmacists, who are constantly alert for them.

A few years ago on the North Shore a printing plant was set up in a home. The operator would steal a doctor's blank and reproduce his own, copying the doctor's letterhead.

But he'd make one change. Instead of printing the doctor's telephone number, he'd print the number of a pay phone at the local railroad station.

The printer would forge the prescription on his own blank and take it to a pharmacist who did not know him and probably didn't know the doctor named on the prescription.

The pharmacist, if doubtful about the prescription, would ask:

"Are you sure Dr. ——— made this out?"

"Sure," the printer would reply calmly. "If you don't believe it, call him up."

The unsuspecting pharmacist would dial the number. And an accomplice of the forger, standing by the pay phone, would answer, say he was the doctor and verify the prescription.

Enforcement officials and leaders of the retail drug industry agree that the overwhelming majority of pharmacists are conscientiously watching for phony orders.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 25, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—IX: DRUG ABUSE BOTH MEDICAL AND LEGAL

(By Ray Richard)

Is the abuse of drugs primarily a medical problem or a legal problem? How you answer this will reveal the basic approaches you believe should be taken to solve the problem.

Medical men are likely to think of it fundamentally as a medical problem. Their stand comes from knowledge of the symptoms and effects drugs have on their victims.

Enforcement men, who daily match wits with desperate men and women, who would go to any extreme, even killing, to get their drugs, emphasize the criminality aspect of drug abuse.

Addiction itself is not a crime. It never has been a Federal offense; it is not a State offense. In 1952 the U.S. Supreme Court held a California statute, which made addiction to narcotics a criminal offense unconstitutional.

The Court ruled, such a statute would be cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the eighth amendment.

The criminality comes from the possessing, selling, purchasing of dope and the fraud, deceit, and misrepresentation often involved. And, of course, many laws are broken by people under the influence of dope.

After nearly 1 year of investigating every aspect of the Nation's drug problem, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse reported it subscribes to "certain aspects" of both the sickness and the criminal attitude about drug abuse.

"Rehabilitation is the humanitarian ideal, to be sought wherever possible," it reported. But it added, "The drug abuser, who steals or who sells drugs to finance his habit, is guilty of a crime. Like any other citizen he should face the consequences. Whether he can be held criminally responsible can only be decided in the courts, case by case. The Commission cannot assert a general rule that every confirmed drug abuser is so impelled by his habit that he is not accountable for his acts under criminal law."

Most enforcement people agree.

Massachusetts officially recognized drug abuse as a medical problem, but not a medical problem exclusively, when the legislature established the new drug addiction center last year. That center is now operating. But while the medical profession, and experts in every field of health, medicine, and social work, seek to solve some of the mysteries entangling the keys to the drug problem, the law enforcement men, to protect the public, continue their dogged war against the drug law violators.

To seek out, find, arrest and convict drug abusers requires special skills. Investigators usually have to work through an informer and with a pusher or user to make an arrest. And this can be highly dangerous.

"There is nobody to complain," points out Alfred J. Murphy, chief inspector of the State drug control division. "The peddler is making a buck and the user is getting his drugs.

"To outsmart them you need to know people, be able to fit yourself into nearly all circumstances, be able to play each development by ear. But what you need most of all is patience."

He, Inspectors William Kearney and Richard Kallil of his division, and Gary Flanagan, Thomas Mitchell and Larry McNamara of the Boston police vice and narcotics squad, once waited 3 days and nights in a Boston home before arresting an addict.

And Detectives Arthur Linsky and Richard Casey of the Boston police narcotics squad recently secreted themselves in a cellar off and on for 3 weeks to arrest a heroin pusher.

Then, too, enforcement men must contend with many angles the addicts use to avoid being caught. Some drink wine or beer after taking dope so alcohol will be blamed. Motorists thought to be drunk from liquor sometimes are under the influence of pills.

The registry of motor vehicles last year suspended licenses of 87 operators for driving under the influence of narcotics, barbiturates and tranquilizers. But others driving under such influence must have been undetected.

The effects of too many drugs, or the wrong drugs, often can be blamed on something else. This is true of tranquilizers, which Andrew MacCurrach, head of the registry's division, which handles cases involving narcotics and drugs, says is causing the registry "as many problems as any other drug."

"When you see Mrs. Smith weaving her way down the sidewalk, you usually don't think its caused by drugs," says Chief Inspector Murphy of the drugs control section. "You figure she's been into the cooking sherry again." But it could just as well be caused by an overdose of drugs—accidental or intentional.

The drugs control section of the State department of public health is one of four agencies, in addition to local police departments, which war on narcotics and the abuse of drugs. It concentrates on policing of drugstores and apprehension of violators of the harmful drug law. The Federal Food and Drug division does the same thing, but has jurisdiction only on cases involving interstate commerce.

The Federal Narcotics Bureau works only on narcotics and concentrates on smuggling and the big-scale operations.

The State police narcotics squad deals with violations of both the narcotic and harmful drug laws. So does the Boston police narcotics squad. Eight-hour days are rare in these agencies.

The Globe survey revealed a commendable spirit of cooperation among these agencies, all of whom frequently work side by side to break a case. Similar cooperation exists between these departments and local police, no doubt due to the State agencies' policy of never moving in on a local case without seeking the help of the local police.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 26, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—X: PARENTS DIDN'T BELIEVE THEIR KIDS

(By Ray Richard)

What can parents do to protect their children from the abuse of drugs?

Plenty—if they heed the national authorities who warn that the abuse is becoming more prevalent, that it breaks out "in pockets" and that it is a potential threat to any community.

Some parents haven't acted in time—maybe because they didn't recognize the problem, maybe because they didn't want to face the facts, maybe because they didn't know how to face the facts.

PARENTS DIDN'T ACT IN TIME

Parents didn't act in time in Westchester County, N.Y., a prosperous suburb of New York City.

Because they hadn't seen the problem themselves, many of them, they didn't do anything about the menace of drugs until the district attorney broke up a ring of 250 youths who had become involved in narcotics. Many of the youths were from well-to-do homes.

Parents didn't act in time in Yonkers, N.Y., either. There, last summer, police announced that 900 boys and girls between 14 and 22 years old were using drugs and that 100 of them had become addicted.

In Belleville, N.J., a city of 38,000, many parents did nothing when they heard rumbles that drugs were being abused but hadn't seen the abuse with their own eyes. That's why they were shocked when the city council last night considered a curfew for teenagers because of the menace of drugs.

And in Stockton, Calif., many parents, not believing reports that more teenagers were taking drugs abusively than ever before, were stunned when they learned last month than a 16-year-old boy died from heart failure after he had consumed 12 bottles of codeine-based cough medicine.

ALMOST EVERY TOWN AFFECTED

The day before Christmas, five Newport, R.I., boys, ages 13 to 15, were sentenced to the Youth Training Center for sniffing glue, a practice which already has killed one Massachusetts youth.

In New Jersey, Assistant Prosecutor Patrick J. Hanifin, 2 weeks ago said, "Almost every community is affected" by the abuse of drugs. "The problem does not extend to a large percentage of youngsters, but it has the potential to spread if something isn't done."

The same is true in Massachusetts. The potential is the thing to worry about.

What can parents do? First, they should recognize the warning issued by the Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse which, on the request of President Kennedy, studied the problem for nearly a year throughout the country. This warning emphasized that the dope problem, once confined to opium dens and the heroin users of the slums, now includes not only heroin and morphine, but the synthetic opiates, dilaudid and demerol, along with cocaine, marihuana, and "LSD 25, mescaline, the barbiturates, the amphetamines, ether, airplane glue, and even so-called tranquilizers."

CALL DOCTOR, THEN POLICE

Then what can parents do? If they detect their children abusing drugs, they should first get medical attention for the abusers, then notify police. If the only wrong the child commits is to take the pills, police probably will not take legal action. They are more interested in finding out where the child got the pills. Cutting off the source is essential to the war on drugs.

Parents also can back programs which reveal the signs and dangers of drug abuse because as the President's Commission urged, "public and professional education on drug abuse is still inadequate. The general public must be educated."

Parental action, and community action, is needed to prevent the "potential" from becoming the reality.

Some parents recognize this. They include three men from East Boston who, in different yet correlated actions, have tried to alert that community to the growing danger from the abuse of drugs.

They are George DeMayo, editor of the weekly East Boston Times-Free Press-Leader; Augustino "Pinky" Casaletto, a city building inspector, and Det. Robert J. Fawcett of the East Boston Division.

WARNED EAST BOSTON OF MENACE

In his widely read paper, DeMayo has vigorously attacked the drug problem for many years. He often runs news of drug arrests as the lead story of his paper. His editorials have urged the community to realize what was going on among the teenagers. And he has given extensive publicity to public meetings at which the problem was discussed.

Five years ago, Casaletto began organizing public meetings to alert East Boston that teenagers were abusing drugs.

He's the father of five boys and has his finger on the pulse of the community's young. He knows who the drug abusers are. And he knows that they know that he knows. With few allies, he has waged a courageous, often personal, war against drugs and against those who provide the drugs which the teenagers can abuse.

He, Joseph Francis, Dr. Charles Cataldo, and Dr. Peter Ferrino at the Ward One Club, ran meetings on the drug problem. Physicians, social workers, inspectors from the State spoke. A crowd of up to 300 attended.

If you roam around Greater Boston looking into the dope menace, you will hear very often the name "Bob Fawcett," a detective on the East Boston division.

Fawcett's fearless campaign against the drug pushers has won the admiration of many—and the reprisals of a few. Five times in 2 years he had to change his unlisted telephone number. And in the past 13 months he's had 13 tires of his own car slashed. Twice he found sugar in his gas tank.

These men face the drug problem realistically. But many don't.

Just as many didn't in Westchester, Yonkers, and Belleville.

[From the Boston (Mass.), Globe, Jan. 27, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—XI: HOW TO KEEP ADDICTS OFF DRUGS?

(By Ray Richard)

The cure for addiction is as big a mystery as the cure for cancer.

Getting an addict off drugs is no problem. Keeping him off is. You can get an addict off drugs by putting him into prison or a mental hospital, but once he is out he may dash to the nearest pusher for a fix.

To get off such addiction, some persons suffer physically as well as emotionally.

When an addict goes off dope abruptly, it is called the cold turkey method of withdrawal. Addicts get off dope this way in jails, in most hospitals and in organizations such as Synanon, which seeks to rehabilitate addicts who voluntarily commit themselves to around-the-clock group therapy.

In Boston there is a branch of a growing organization called Teen Challenge, which stresses religious inspiration to get addicts off drugs "cold turkey" and to stay off.

Other organizations have been formed within the community to help addicts stay off. Among them is Drug Addicts Anonymous, which offers addicts the same form of group therapy at regular meetings which Alcoholics Anonymous offers alcoholics.

Twice weekly, at the Matt Talbott Center, 21 James Street, South End, near Boston City Hospital in the former Boston College High School Building, 30 or more addicts help each other to kick the habit. More than 125 men and women addicted to drugs have attended these meetings since they began a year ago, and Rev. Richard A. Drea, S.J., director, urges addicts to let this organization help them.

Three-quarters of those admitted were addicted to pills. That's why they took the name Drug Addicts Anonymous.

Chapters of Narcotics Anonymous meet regularly in many prisons and jails throughout the State and outside the walls.

None of these organizations give out narcotics—they couldn't legally—but there is a growing concept that dispensing narcotics under strict scientific supervision is the most effective and humane way to get an addict off dope. Once off, aftercare by social workers takes over.

In Great Britain, doctors dispense narcotics to addicts who the physicians believe need them, and the entire approach to the addiction problem is medically oriented. There is strict regulation over all domestic drug supplies and transfers and "strict control to prevent unauthorized, improper, or indiscriminate supplying of narcotics," as the White House Conference was told by Dr. Edward M. Schur, associate professor at Tufts University and a leading authority in this country on the British system.

Advocates of this method believe that it knocks the pins out from under the illicit drug market because addicts can get legally what they need in the opinion of a doctor.

Massachusetts is making a dramatic attempt to find out the best method for getting an addict off drugs and keeping him off. The legislature has authorized the establishment of a drug addiction rehabilitation board which could make this State a front-runner in the treatment of the dope problem.

The board is headed by the commissioners of public health, mental health, and correction. The director is Lawrence D. Gaughan, who has an extensive background in social work.

The board opened a rehabilitation center last July at Boston State Hospital in Mattapan. It became fully staffed in November. It has accepted 85 patients and had to turn away many more for lack of facilities.

In this project, more than in any other in this State, lies the hope for solving the addiction problem for the victims and the community.

To be admitted to the center, most addicts are committed by the courts, although a few are let in voluntarily. The commitment procedures deal with the addict as a medical problem, not as a criminal.

The minimum commitment is 2 years, but only about 6 weeks is spent at the hospital. The remainder is back in the community under supervision of an aftercare program by social workers.

Patients are withdrawn by the scientific administration of methadon, a weak narcotic which lets the addict down gradually, but under no conditions does an addict get methadon while back in the community.

The project is still experimental, but it is off on the right track, Gaughan believes, because it is patterned after the treatments which have proved successful in other States.

"All of these," he points out, "have civil commitment procedures, use methadon in withdrawal and have a very strong aftercare program."

The aftercare is essential. At his center, efforts are made "to get each patient back into the community as soon as possible," Gaughan said, "but under supervision within the community and with the support of vocational therapy and, if needed, public welfare and other help."

A big reason why the project has progressed so well, he emphasizes, has been "the existence of intelligent law enforcement people who recognize there was a need for treatment and rehabilitation of addicts."

He sees organizations such as Drug Addicts Anonymous of real value.

"At this stage I think any program that is using reasonable or standardized methods of treatment has a place in the community. It is much too soon to turn thumbs down on any type of procedure.

Gaughan and the board have big hopes and plans. Some day they could produce the Nation's model program for attacking the drug problem. Maybe they already have.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 28, 1965]

THE DRUG MENACE—XII: WHAT CAN BE DONE

(By Ray Richard)

What can Congress, the State legislature, doctors, pharmacists, teachers, parents do to reduce the menace from drugs?

The problem is complex and so are the solutions. And the problem has been clouded by emotion, misinformation, lack of facts and contrasting philosophies on how the law, the medical profession, the community should fight the problem.

But new solutions constantly are being sought by experts at every level of government. And nearly every recommendation has a built-in controversy which can be resolved only after extensive study and debate.

The changes which come in the fight—and some people even reject the idea of calling it a fight—generally will be the result of a changing philosophy which nationally, and certainly in Massachusetts, considers the problem more of a medical problem, yet not less of a legal problem, than in the past. But there are dissenters to this change and to the degree to which the change should be made.

The trend is to try to solve the problem of addiction medically while concentrating enforcement measures on the illicit market and the pushers. This doesn't mean, however, the addict can go unpunished for breaking the law.

The Globe, in its survey, consulted with nearly 100 persons and scores of agencies. Addicts, sociologists, penologists, police, educators were consulted. Most offered recommendations to help in their common effort to stop the dope menace.

Basic to the problem nationally is passage of the so-called Dodd bill, named after its sponsor, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut. The bill was passed unanimously in the Senate last year but died in the House. Senator EDWARD KENNEDY is among the cosponsors of the bill in the current session.

The bill would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to tighten the controls on the "manufactures, compounders, and processors of barbiturates and of amphetamine and other habit-forming stimulant drugs."

It also would prohibit the possession of such drugs for use other than for "the personal use of the possessor, a member of his household or for administration to an animal belonging to him."

And special consideration should be given by the legislature to the needs of the drug addiction rehabilitation board which appears to offer the mechanism by which many of the social and medical problems created by the drug problem can be solved.

These needs during the next few years will include the expansion of the board's center, now limited to 12 beds at Boston State Hospital where there is now a long waiting list of addicts desiring treatment; a 24-hour outpatient clinic for emergencies; a day-care center; a laboratory; a social service department and psychological testing facilities; research and education programs.

"Now, the ward at Boston State Hospital, originally set up to develop new and different techniques of drug addiction treatment, is being so pressed for service that its original purpose has become obscured," say the center's director, Lawrence D. Gaughan.

Parents and teachers are urged to watch for signs of drug abuse in their children and the neighborhood and to cooperate with police in seeking the sources.

And for everyone there is this advice written by a Globe reader: "Abusing pep pills and narcotics will ruin not only your life but your family's." She knows. Her 17-year-old son swallowed six barbiturates and died.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on March 9, 1965, the Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, which would provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, as proposed by Senator MONRONEY and other Senators. As a member of the Rules Committee, and of the Subcommittee on Standing Rules of the Senate, I listened to the testimony presented by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] on this concurrent resolution when it was before the committee on March 1, 1965. I believe Senator ALLOTT made important points which were very useful to the committee in its consideration of the resolution and which I know will be carefully considered by the joint committee to be established to study reorganization of the working procedures of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Senator ALLOTT on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GORDON ALLOTT ON MONRONEY CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION PLAN BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE ON MARCH 1, 1965

I joined Senator MONRONEY in sponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 because I am

convinced that the review it authorizes is long overdue. A "horse-and-buggy" Congress cannot adequately cope with the problems of the "age of rockets," and it will become increasingly more difficult in the future.

The review to be made by the joint committee established by this resolution will cover two major fields of inquiry which may be stated as follows:

1. How Congress does its work, and how it might do it more effectively; and

2. What Congress fails to do that it should be doing.

The first of these questions will likely receive most of the attention of the committee, and perhaps it must be resolved before the second question can be decided. Many of us are well aware of the numerous deficiencies in how Congress does its work, because we are so familiar with its processes. Certainly, the correction of such deficiencies should be a primary target of the efforts of the committee. But, preoccupation with the first question should not be to the exclusion of the second question which will receive little attention in the daily workings of Congress. Therefore, it is my intention to direct attention to what I consider a major area of deficiency, in the hope that it will receive the consideration I feel it deserves.

The genius of our system of Government lies in the balance maintained through the checks one branch of Government can exercise over the other two. But, there can be no balance if the checks are not applied. Of course, indiscriminate use of congressional checks would be obstructionary, but by the same token laxity in applying congressional checks when the occasion clearly demands it amounts to dereliction. If we in Congress are to perform our sworn duty to our constituents and the Nation, we must be ever alert to abuses of power, particularly by the executive establishment because of its nature, but also by the judiciary. And, we must never shrink from applying the necessary checks with discretion.

In recent years we have witnessed a fantastic expansion of the executive establishment to a point where it is beyond the control of one man and even beyond one man's comprehension. Such bureaucratic proliferation is the greatest of all diluents of the vote, of the citizen. The bureaucratic behemoth conspicuously lacks any sense of built-in, self-imposed limitation or restraint, it treats the whole area of public policy and national interest as its own exclusive playground, and responds to every challenge to its undivided authority with thinly veiled contempt or finally with sheer fury. Bureaucrats are seldom responsive to the wishes of the people since none are elected. The man elected to command and control them becomes a captive of the bureaucracies. A vigilant and unafraid Congress is essential if this Government is to remain a government "of the people."

What does Congress fail to do that it should be doing?

I believe that Congress fails to exercise the surveillance over the executive establishment and the regulatory bodies of its own creation, that the citizens of this country are entitled to expect. All too frequently the agencies and bureaus engaged in jurisdictional power struggles between themselves, with a total disregard for the public welfare. A recent example of this is the battle for jurisdiction by the Securities and Exchange Commission over commingled trust funds held by a national bank subject to the jurisdiction of the Comptroller of the Currency. The results of this particular skirmish are still undecided, but too often power grabs leading to endless and wasteful duplication are successful. Or, on the other hand, one bureau or agency achieves congressional approval for a particular pet program, which has a lot of attractive appeal, all the other bureaus and agencies never rest until they have a similar program of their own. A recent study on Federal educational programs reveals an average duplication factor of 6.7. This duplication factor of nearly seven times is an indictment of Congress. We should have never allowed this traversty to occur. Congress failed to apply its check. An abuse of power may also be the failure to exercise it.

Congressional checks have not been applied in the past when they should have been probably for one of the following three reasons:

1. Congress was not aware of certain abuses of the executive branch or was apathetic to them;

2. Congress could not apply its check because it had previously abdicated its authority legislatively;

3. The congressional check was applied but it proved to be ineffectual because Congress did not or could not follow through.

A large part of the blame for the failure of Congress to resolutely and appropriately apply its "check" must be placed on its inadequate staffing, and this inadequacy is particularly acute on the minority side in the Senate committees. Since there are half as many minority Senators, they must in effect cover twice the ground that the majority must cover. This multiplies the difficulty of their job in being effective as the internal "check" as our system envisions. Under our system the majority relies upon the minority to point out its errors lest those errors become fateful. This system has served the Nation well for nearly 200 years, but it is presently in danger of being destroyed because the minority has been so weakened—weakened not only in numbers, but more importantly, weakened in effectiveness through lack of effective tools. The tools most needed are adequate and competent committee staff members. The smaller the minority the greater the need for staff. Americans for Democratic Action have also recognized the need for adequate staffing for the minority party members of the committees. Let us hope that the Congress will also recognize this need.

I am informed that on some committees there are as many as 15 members to every minority staff member. On other committees the staffs are "nonpartisan." There is no such thing as "nonpartisan" staff when the work of the staff is directed by the chairman or the staff director of the chairman's choosing. "Nonpartisan" staff amounts to "no staff" for the minority in most instances. I am personally acquainted with a past situation where the one and only minority staff member of a committee was required to use a stenographer from the majority staff. Therefore, for anything of a confidential nature he had to rely on the personal staff of minority Senators for typing. Such a situation is not only absurd, it is intolerable.

On the two standing committees which I serve, there is on one which I consider to be an acute situation, while the other is bad but not so acute. Consider the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the staffing ratio is 12 to 2. There is one staff man to cover six subcommittees and the full committee. There are times when it is physically impossible for him to cover the activities of the subcommittees. I consider the inadequacy of minority staff on this committee as acute.

Now consider the Appropriations Committee where the professional staff is on a ratio of 22 to 4. Minority staffing is too slim to allow the minority to follow up on appropriation measures and determine whether the various agencies have spent moneys as directed by the committee. I consider this situation very bad. Congressional "checks" are not applied through a sheer lack of information.

Certainly I would not advocate equal staffing. The majority has certain "housekeeping" functions that require a larger staff, but I do advocate equitable staffing. By equitable staffing I mean sufficient minority staff members to permit the minority to be an effective part of the legislative process. There have been proposals of a 60-to-40 ratio, and this may be appropriate in some instances; however, I do not think that an inflexible ratio can be applied in all instances. On some committees an 80-to-20 ratio may be appropriate, while on others a ratio approaching 50-to-50 may be appropriate. It depends upon the nature of the committee and its work.

If our legislative work is to be other than perfunctory and Congress is to be more than a machine grinding out laws in a thoughtless and mechanical manner, we must have adequate staffing on both sides of the "party aisle," and the minority side is now dangerously lacking. The bipartisan study called for by Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 can be the key to a revitalized Congress—a Congress that accepts its duty and performs it diligently. The American people deserve nothing less. I respectfully urge favorable and early action on this important and urgent legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the calendar be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 71, and I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the appropriate places in the RECORD explanations of the measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

GRANTING THE CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO A COMPACT RELATING TO TAXATION OF MOTOR FUELS CONSUMED BY INTERSTATE BUSES AND TO AN AGREEMENT RELATING TO BUS TAXATION PRORATION AND RECIPROCITY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 307) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The consent of Congress is hereby given to any of the several States and to the District of Columbia to enter into a compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to the participation in such compact of the Provinces of Canada and the States, territories and Federal District of Mexico. Such compact shall be in substantially the following form:

COMPACT ON TAXATION OF MOTOR FUELS CONSUMED BY INTERSTATE BUSES

Article I—Purposes

The purposes of this agreement are to—

(a) avoid multiple taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to assure

each State of its fair share of motor fuel taxes;

(b) establish and facilitate the administration of a criterion of motor fuel taxation for interstate buses which is reasonably related to the use of highway and related facilities and services in each of the party States; and

(c) encourage the availability of a maximum number of buses for intrastate service by removing motor fuel taxation as a deterrent in the routing of interstate buses.

Article II—Definitions

(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, the Provinces of Canada, and the States, territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the motor fuel taxes involved.

(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

(e) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

(f) Gallon: Gallon shall mean the liquid measure containing 231 cubic inches.

Article III—Governing principle

For purposes of this compact, the primary principle for the imposition of motor fuel taxes shall be consumption of such fuel within the State. Motor fuel consumed by buses shall be taxed on the existing basis, as it may be from time to time, and under the procedures for collection of such taxes by each party State, except that to the extent that this compact makes provision therefor, or for any matter connected therewith, such provision shall govern.

Article IV—How fuel consumed to be ascertained

The amount of fuel used in the operation of any bus within this State shall be conclusively presumed to be the number of miles operated by such bus within the State divided by the average mileage per gallon obtained by the bus during the tax period in all operations, whether within or without the party State. Any owner or operator of two or more buses shall calculate average mileage within the meaning of this article by computing single average figures covering all buses owned or operated by him.

Article V—Imposition of tax

Every owner or operator of buses shall pay to the party State taxes equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon multiplied by the number of gallons used in its operations in the party State.

Article VI—Reports

On or before the last business day of the month following the month being reported upon, each bus owner or operator subject to the payment of fuel taxes pursuant to this compact shall make such reports of its operations as the State administrator of motor fuel taxes may require and shall furnish the State administrator in each other party State wherein his buses operate a copy of such report.

Article VII—Credit for payment of fuel taxes

Each bus owner or operator shall be entitled to a credit equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon on all motor fuel purchased by such operator within the party State for use in operations either within or without the party State, and upon which the motor fuel tax imposed by the laws of such party State has been paid.

Article VIII—Additional tax or refund

If the bus owner or operator's monthly report shows a debit balance after taking credit pursuant to article VII, a remittance in such net amount due shall be made with the report. If the report shows a credit balance, after taking credit as herein provided, a refund in such net amount as has been overpaid shall be made by the party State to such owner or operator.

Article IX—Entry into force and withdrawal

This compact shall enter into force when enacted into law by any two States. Thereafter it shall enter into force and become binding upon any State subsequently joining when such State has enacted the compact into law. Withdrawal from the compact shall be by act of the legislature of a party State, but shall not take effect until one year after the Governor of the withdrawing State has notified the Governor of each other party State, in writing, of the withdrawal.

Article X—Construction and severability

This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters.

SEC. 102. As used in the compact set forth in section 101 with reference to the District of Columbia—

(1) the term "legislature" shall mean the Congress of the United States; and

(2) the term "Governor" shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 103. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the compact authorized by section 101 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such compact. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 104. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the compact authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation of buses (as that term is defined in the compact) in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such compact.

SEC. 105. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The consent of Congress is hereby given to any of the several States and to the District of Columbia to enter in a bus taxation proration and reciprocity agreement and to the participation in such agreement of the Provinces of Canada and the States, territories, and Federal District of Mexico. Such agreement shall be in substantially the following form:

BUS TAXATION PRORATION AND RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT

Article I—Purposes and principles

SECTION 1. Purposes of agreement: It is the purpose of this agreement to set up a system whereby any contracting State may permit owners of fleets of buses operating in two or more States to prorate the registration of the buses in such fleets in each State in which the fleets operate on the basis of the proportion of miles operating within such State to total fleet miles, as defined herein.

SEC. 2. Principle of proration of registration: It is hereby declared that in making this agreement the contracting States adhere to the principle that each State should have the freedom to develop the kind of highway user tax structure that it determines to be most appropriate to itself, that the method of taxation of interstate buses should not be a determining factor in developing its user tax structure, and that annual taxes or other taxes of the fixed-fee type upon buses which are not imposed on a basis that reflects the amount of highway use should be apportioned among the States, within the limits of practicality, on the basis of vehicle miles traveled within each of the States.

Article II—Definitions

(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, the Provinces of Canada, and the States, territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the fee involved, or, in the case of proration of registration, the official or agency of a State administering the proration of registration in that State.

(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

(e) Base State: Base State shall mean the State from or in which the bus is most frequently dispatched, garaged, serviced, maintained, operated, or otherwise controlled, or also in the case of a fleet bus the State to which it is allocated for registration under statutory requirements. In order that this section may not be used for the purpose of evasion of registration fees, the administrators of the contracting States may make the final decision as to the proper base State, in accordance with article III(h) hereof, to prevent or avoid such evasion.

(f) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

(g) Fleet: As to each contracting State, fleet shall include only those buses which actually travel a portion of their total miles in such State. A fleet must include three or more buses.

(h) Registration: Registration shall mean the registration of a bus and the payment of annual fees and taxes as set forth in or pursuant to the laws of the respective contracting States.

(i) Proration of registration: Proration of registration shall mean registration of fleets of buses in accordance with Article IV of this agreement.

(j) Reciprocity: Reciprocity shall mean that each contracting State, to the extent provided in this agreement, exempts a bus from registration and registration fees.

Article III—General provisions

(a) Effect on other agreements, arrangements, and understandings: On and after its effective date, this agreement shall supersede any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between any two or more of the contracting States covering, in whole or in part, any of the matters covered by this agreement; but this agreement shall not affect any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between a contracting State and a State or States not party to this agreement.

(b) Applicability to exempt vehicles: This agreement shall not require registration in a contracting State of any vehicles which are in whole or part exempt from registration under the laws or regulations of such State without respect to this agreement.

(c) Inapplicability to caravaned vehicles: The benefits and privileges of this agreement shall not be extended to a vehicle operated on its own wheels, or in tow of a motor vehicle, transported for the purpose of selling or offering the same for sale to or by any agent, dealer, purchaser, or prospective purchaser.

(d) Other fees and taxes: This agreement does not waive any fees or taxes charged or levied by any State in connection with the ownership or operation of vehicles other than registration fees as defined herein. All other fees and taxes shall be paid to each State in accordance with the laws thereof.

(e) Statutory vehicle regulations: This agreement shall not authorize the operation of a vehicle in any contracting State contrary to the laws or regulations thereof, except those pertaining to registration and payment of fees; and with respect to such laws or regulations, only to the extent provided in this agreement.

(f) Violations: Each contracting State reserves the right to withdraw, by order of the administrator thereof, all or any part of the benefits or privileges granted pursuant to this agreement from the owner of any vehicle or fleet of vehicles operated in violation of any provision of this agreement. The administrator shall immediately give notice of any such violation and withdrawal of any such benefits or privileges to the administrator of each other contracting State in which vehicles of such owner are operated.

(g) Cooperation: The administrator of each of the contracting States shall cooperate with the administrators of the others and each contracting State hereby agrees to furnish such aid and assistance to each other within its statutory authority as will aid in the proper enforcement of this agreement.

(h) Interpretation: In any dispute between or among contracting States arising under this agreement, the final decision regarding interpretation of questions at issue relating to this agreement shall be reached by joint action of the contracting States, acting through the administrator thereof, and shall upon determination be placed in writing.

(i) Effect of headings: Article and section headings contained herein shall not be deemed to govern, limit, modify, or in any manner affect the scope, meaning, or intent of the provisions of any article or part hereof.

(j) Entry into force: This agreement shall enter into force and become binding between and among the contracting States when enacted or otherwise entered into by any two States. Thereafter, it shall enter into force and become binding with respect to any State when enacted into law by such State. If the statutes of any State so authorize or provide, such State may become party to this agreement upon the execution thereof by an executive or administrative official thereof acting on behalf of and for such State.

Article IV—Proration of registration

(a) Applicability: Any owner of a fleet may register the buses of said fleet in any contracting State by paying to said State total registration fees in an amount equal to that obtained by applying the proportion of in-State fleet miles divided by the total fleet miles, to the total fees which would otherwise be required for regular registration of each and all of such vehicles in such contracting State.

All fleet pro rata registration fees shall be based upon the mileage proportions of the fleet during the period of twelve months ending on August 31 next preceding the commencement of the registration year for which registration is sought: Except that mileage proportions for a fleet not operated during such period in the State where application for registration is made will be determined by the administrator upon the sworn application of the applicant showing the operations during such period in other States and the estimated operations during the registration year for which registration is sought, in the State in which application is being made; or if no operations were conducted during such period a full statement of the proposed method of operation.

If any buses operate in two or more States which permit the proration of registration on the basis of a fleet of buses consisting of a lesser number of vehicles than provided in article II(g), such fleet may be prorated as to registration in such States, in which event the buses in such fleet shall not be required to register in any other contracting States if each such vehicle is registered in some contracting State (except to the extent it is exempt from registration as provided in article III(b)).

If the administrator of any State determines, based on his method of the operation thereof, that the inclusion of a bus or buses as a part of a fleet would, adversely affect the proper fleet fee which should be paid to his State, having due regard for fairness and equity, he may refuse to permit any or all of such buses to be included in his State as a part of such fleet.

(b) Total fleet miles: Total fleet miles, with respect to each contracting State, shall mean the total miles operated by the fleet (1) in such State, (2) in all other contracting States, (3) in other States having proportional registration provisions, (4) in States with which such contracting State has reciprocity, and (5) in such other States as the administrator determines should be included under the circumstances in order to protect or promote the interest of his State; except that in States having laws requiring proration on the basis of a different determination of total fleet miles, total fleet miles shall be determined on such basis.

(c) Leased vehicles: If a bus is operated by a person other than the owner as a part of a fleet which is subject to the provisions of this article, then the operator of such fleet shall be deemed to be the owner of said bus for the purposes of this article.

(d) Extent of privileges: Upon the registration of a fleet in a contracting State pursuant to this article, each bus in the fleet may be operated in both interstate and intrastate operations in such State (except as provided in article III(e)).

(e) Application for proration: The application for proration of registration shall be made in each contracting State upon substantially the application forms and supplements authorized by joint action of the administrators of the contracting States.

(f) Issuance of identification: Upon registration of a fleet, the State which is the base State of a particular bus of the fleet, shall issue the required license plates and registration card for such bus and each contracting State in which the fleet of which such bus is a part, operates shall issue a special identification identifying such bus as a part of a fleet which has fully complied with the registration requirements of such State. The required license plates, registration cards, and identification shall be appropriately displayed in the manner required by or pursuant to the laws of each respective State.

(g) Additions to fleet: If any bus is added to a prorated fleet after the filing of the original application, the owner shall file a supplemental application. The owner shall register such bus in each contracting State in like manner as provided for buses listed in an original application and the registration fee payable shall be determined on the mileage proportion used to determine the registration fees payable for buses registered under the original application.

(h) Withdrawals from fleet: If any bus is withdrawn from a prorated fleet during the period for which it is registered or identified, the owner shall notify the administrator of each State in which it is registered or identified of such withdrawal and shall return the plates, and registration card or identification as may be required by or pursuant to the laws of the respective States.

(i) Audits: The administrator of each contracting State shall, within the statutory authority of such administrator, make any information obtained upon an audit of records of any applicant for proration of registration available to the administrators of the other contracting States.

(j) Errors in registration: If it is determined by the administrator of a contracting State, as a result of such audits or otherwise, that an improper fee has been paid his State, or errors in registration found, the administrator may require the fleet owner to make the necessary corrections in the registration of his fleet and payment of fees.

Article V—Reciprocity

(a) Grant of reciprocity: Each of the contracting States grants reciprocity as provided in this article.

(b) Applicability: The provisions of this agreement with respect to reciprocity shall apply only to a bus properly registered in the base State of the bus, which State must be a contracting State.

(c) Nonapplicability to fleet buses: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall not apply to a bus which is entitled to be registered or identified as part of a prorated fleet.

(d) Extent of reciprocity: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall permit the interstate operation of a bus and intrastate operation which is incidental to a trip of such bus involving interstate operation.

(e) Other agreements: Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to prohibit any of the contracting States from entering into separate agreements with each other for the granting of temporary permits for the intrastate operation of vehicles registered in the other State; nor to prevent any of the contracting States from entering into agreements to grant reciprocity for intrastate operation within any zone or zones agreed upon by the States.

Article VI—Withdrawal or revocation

Any contracting State may withdraw from this agreement upon thirty days' written notice to each other contracting State, which notice shall be given only after the repeal of this agreement by the legislature of such State, if adoption was by legislative act, or after renunciation by the appropriate administrative official of such contracting State if the laws thereof empower him so to renounce.

Article VII—Construction and severability

This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable

and if any phase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability hereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters.

SEC. 202. The Board of Commissioners shall have the power to make such exemptions from the coverage of the agreement as may be appropriate and to make such changes in methods for the reporting of any information required to be furnished to the District of Columbia pursuant to the agreement as, in his judgment, shall be suitable: *Provided*, That any such exemptions or changes shall not be contrary to the purposes set forth in article I of the agreement and shall be made in order to permit the continuance of uniformity of practice among the contracting States with respect to buses.

SEC. 203. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the agreement authorized by section 201 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such agreement. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 204. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the agreement authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation and registration of buses in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such agreement.

SEC. 205. Unless otherwise provided in any statute withdrawing the District of Columbia from participation in the agreement, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be the officer to give notice of withdrawal therefrom.

SEC. 206. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The excerpt from the report (No. 76), explaining the purposes of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill, as amended, is to grant the consent of the Congress, pursuant to section 10, article I, of the Constitution of the United States, to a compact relating to the taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation, proration, and reciprocity. This bill is divided into two titles. Title I would grant such consent for the several States and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact on the apportionment of taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses. Title II would grant a like consent to the several States and the District of Columbia to enter into a bus taxation and reciprocity agreement on proration and registration and other fixed fees, based on the miles traveled by buses in the respective States. The compact also allows and consents to the participation in this compact of the political subdivisions of Canada and Mexico.

CARNETTA GERMAINE THOMAS HUNTE

The bill (S. 190) for the relief of Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be is enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The excerpt from the report (No. 79), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

The beneficiary of the bill is a 48-year-old native of Barbados, a subject of Great Britain, and a citizen of Canada who entered the United States on September 2, 1960, as a visitor. She presently resides in Boston, Mass., with her aged uncle who has no other relatives and suffers from diabetes. Information is to be effect that the beneficiary devotes full time to her seriously ill uncle and desires to continue to care for him.

SUNNYSIDE SEED FARMS

The bill (S. 195) for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, to the Sunnyside Seed Farms, of Middleton, Wisconsin, the sum of $10,200, in full satisfaction of all its claims against the United States for storage charges for the failure to use certain facilities of such firm for a two-year period from November 1, 1951, through November 1, 1953, pursuant to the storage guarantee agreement (alpm (FX) 24721): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The excerpt from the report (No. 80), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay to the Sunnyside Seed Farms, of Middleton, Wis., the sum of $10,200, for its claims against the United States for storage charges for the failure to use certain facilities in the period November 1, 1951, through November 1, 1953, pursuant to a storage guarantee agreement.

A similar bill for this claimant, S. 1832, was introduced in the 88th Congress in the amount of $17,318.15. In a report from the Department of Agriculture, received subsequent to the adjournment of the 88th Congress, the Department advised the committee that it would have no objection to the enactment of the bill if it were amended to provide for the payment of $10,200. The bill, S. 195, as introduced in the 89th Congress, provides for payment in this amount.

LESTER W. HEIN AND SADIE HEIN

The bill (S. 574) for the relief of Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress asembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein, of Independence, Missouri, the sum of $9,020.78. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein against the United States for compensation for damages sustained by them when, or August 7, 1960, while returning from annual field training, a five-ton federally owned wrecker assigned to the One Hundred Tenth Engineer Battalion of the Missouri Army National Guard, Kansas City, Missouri, crashed into a store owned by the said Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be delivered to or received by any insurance company as a subrogee for any portion of the amount appropriated to the claimants by this Act. Any persion violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The excerpt from the report (No. 92), explaining the purposcs of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein, of Independence, Mo., the sum of $9,020.78. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Lester W. and Sadie Hein against the United States for compensation for damages sustained by them when, on August 7, 1960, while returning from annual field training, a 5-ton federally owned wrecker assigned to the 110th Engineer Battalion of the Missouri Army National Guard, Kansas City,

Mo., crashed into a store owned by the claimants.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

The bill (S. 619) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nora Isabella Samuelli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. The time Nora Isabella Samuelli has resided and been physically present in the United States since July 31, 1963, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The excerpt from the report (No. 94), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Nora Isabella Samuelli. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee. A further purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization immediately.

The beneficiary of the bill is a 50-year-old native of Rumania, who is now a stateless person. She was an employee of the U.S. Information Service at the American Legation in Bucharest from December 1945 to July 25, 1949, when she was arrested by Rumanian authorities and accused of espionage in favor of the United States. Thereafter, she was imprisoned until her release in July 1961. Her sister, who worked for the British Government, was imprisoned during the same period on similar charges. Upon their release, her family was stripped of all its possessions and permitted to proceed to France. The beneficiary resided in France until she was admitted to this country as a nonimmigrant visitor on July 31, 1963. She now resides in New York City with, and is supported by, a cousin.

CHUNG K. WON

The bill (S. 642) for the relief of Chung K. Won was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chung K. Won shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. Won Wing, a citizen of the United States.

The excerpt from the report (No. 97), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Chung K. Won to qualify for nonquota immigrant status as the minor adopted son of a citizen of the United States which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of citizens of the United States.

The beneficiary of the bill is a 24-year-old native and citizen of China, who presently resides in Hong Kong. His natural mother and father are deceased. He was adopted under Chinese custom when released to his adoptive parents in 1943 by his natural mother. His adoptive parents and their natural daughter reside in the United States and the adoptive father is a U.S. citizen. The beneficiary resided with his adoptive mother from 1943 until she entered the United States for permanent residence in 1954. The beneficiary is dependent upon his adoptive father for support.

ENRICO AGOSTINI AND CELESTINO AGOSTINI

The bill (S. 829) for the relief of Enrico Agostini and Celestino Agostini was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Enrico Agostini and Celestino Agostini shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The excerpt from the report (No. 101), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Enrico Agostini and Celestino Agostini. The bill provides for appropriate quota deductions and for the payment of the required visa fees.

The beneficiaries of the bill are a 28-year-old father and his 5-year-old son, both natives and citizens of Italy, who entered the United States on November 28, 1961, as visitors. The adult beneficiary's first wife died in Italy in 1961 and he married a lawful permanent resident of the United States in Bridgeport, Conn., on March 10, 1962. The minor beneficiary was adopted by his stepmother on August 23, 1962. A third preference visa petition on behalf of the adult beneficiary was filed on March 20, 1962, and approved on July 9, 1962. Adjustment under section 245 was denied in November 1962 because third preference under the Italian quota was not then available. It is alleged that the third preference was current when application for adjustment was filed in July of 1962. The minor beneficiary is being treated by a specialist for a deformity, club foot.

JOSE L. RODRIGUEZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 440) for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose L. Rodriguez shall be held and considered to have retained his priority on the quota waiting list as of March 24, 1952, the date on which he first registered as an intending immigrant.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The excerpt from the report (No. 107), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to preserve a prior registration date on the quota waiting list in behalf of Jose L. Rodriguez, which was canceled by the Department of State. The bill, as introduced, would have granted the beneficiary permanent residence in the United States and provided for the deduction of a quota number. By preserving the beneficiary's prior registration date, he will be in a position to qualify for nonquota status under the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 87-885.

The beneficiary of the bill is a 42-year-old native and citizen of Spain, who entered the United States as a visitor on August 15, 1958. Since 1959, the beneficiary has been employed as a sheepherder, and he plans to continue in this employment if granted permanent residence in the United States. The beneficiary's wife and three minor children reside in Spain. His widowed mother is a naturalized U.S. citizen residing in Detroit, Mich. The beneficiary's brother and sister are natives and citizens of the United States. The beneficiary registered on the quota waiting list, together with his wife and two children, at São Paulo, Brazil, as of March 24, 1952. This registration was canceled on December 1, 1958, because the aliens had moved and left no forwarding address. The beneficiary had, in the meantime, reregistered on the quota waiting list at the American consulate in Madrid, Spain, as of June 7, 1954. A fourth preference visa petition was approved in behalf of the beneficiary on March 22, 1960. The beneficiary assists in the care of his citizen mother, who is in poor health.

PROFESSIONAL PHOTOGRAPHY WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That as a tribute to the professional photographer and his many works and in recognition of the importance of professional photography in our life today and in America's future, the President is authorized to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 2 through May 8, 1965, as Professional Photography Week, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The preamble was agreed to.

The excerpt from the report (No. 113), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 976) to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargability of taxes in bankruptcy was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

The bill (S. 618) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nora Isabella Samuelli, the sum of $55,000 as a gratuity for the sacrifices sustained by her as a result of having been imprisoned for twelve years by the Communist Government of Rumania on charges that the said Nora Isabella Samuelli acted as a spy for the United States while employed in the United States Legation in Bucharest, Rumania: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. The period from July 24, 1949, to June 14, 1961, inclusive, during which Nora Isabella Samuelli was imprisoned by the Communist Government of Rumania on charges that she acted as a spy for the United States while employed in the United States Legation in Bucharest, Rumania, shall be determined to be creditable service for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251, et seq.).

The excerpt from the report (No. 115), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nora Isabella Samuelli the sum of $55,000 as a gratuity for the sacrifices sustained by her as a result of having been imprisoned for 12 years by the Communist government of Rumania on charges that the said Nora Isabella Samuelli acted as a spy for the United States while employed in the U.S. Legation in Bucharest, Rumania. The bill also contains a prohibition against the payment of attorney's fees and grants to the claimant creditable service for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act those years which she spent in incarceration.

S. 2414, of the 88th Congress, as amended by the committee, is identical to the present bill, S. 618, and was reported by the committee on September 16, 1964, and passed the Senate on September 24, 1964.

The facts are set forth in Senate report No. 1588 on S. 2414 of the 88th Congress, and are as follows:

"The beneficiary, Nora Isabella Samuelli, was born in Rumania on July 9, 1914, and is a stateless person. She graduated from high school and attended law school for 3 years in her native country. Miss Samuelli, who has never married, resides in Paris, France. She is presently in New York City pending action on her claim and is not employed. She has no income or appreciable assets. A well-to-do widowed cousin, also living in New York City, underwrites the beneficiary's complete living expenses and provides financial contributions for her personal needs. Miss Samuelli's widowed mother and brother are political refugees residing in France. Her only sister, who is single, is a British subject, presently in the United States as a temporary visitor.

"Miss Samuelli stated that in December 1945 she became an employee of the U.S. Information Service at the American Legation in Bucharest, Rumania. She continued in this employment until on or about July 25, 1949, when without warning she was seized by Rumanian authorities and accused of high treason and espionage in favor of the United States. Thereafter, she was incarcerated in two penal institutions until her release in July 1961. Her sister, Annie Samuelli, who was employed in the same city by the British Government, was also arrested on a similar charge and detained during the same period. Upon her release, she was granted British citizenship in recognition of her service. In September 1961 the entire family was stripped of its possessions and, upon payment of a ransom by a distant relative in the West, was allowed to proceed to France where they were granted permanent residence. Miss Samuelli resided there until her departure for this country. She is the holder of a French travel document for refugees resident in France valid until May 14, 1965."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on March 10, 1965, the Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported S. 618 and S. 619, bills for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli. On these two bills, S. 618 introduced by Senator DODD, and S. 619 which I introduced, we were joined as sponsors by Senators JAVITS, PELL, HARTKE, and KENNEDY of Massachusetts. These bills are similar to two private bills that I introduced in 1963, and that were passed by the Senate in the last session of the Congress. Both in the 88th Congress, and in this Congress, Senator DODD, as chairman of the subcommittee which formulated action on these bills, gave unceasingly of his time and efforts to bring out the facts and to develop bills to grant the needed relief for Miss Samuelli. I very much appreciate the attention and support given by the committee and the chairman [Mr. EASTLAND] to these bills, and I know that all of the Senators who have sponsored this legislation are pleased at the immediate Senate action on these bills. I hope this action will hasten the granting of the deserved relief which would be provided by these bills.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: I wish to note that the bills for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli, which have been passed, involve a woman who suffered terribly at the hands of the Communists because she was an employee of the American Embassy. It has taken a long time to do justice in this matter. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I were both interested, as were also other Senators. I express my gratitude to the majority leader and to the committee which has reported out the bills and brought about their enactment today.

BENJAMIN A. RAMELB

This bill (S. 149) for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Benjamin A. Ramelb, of Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii, the sum of $68,240 in full settlement of all the claims against the United States of the said Benjamin A. Ramelb arising out of injuries he received when struck by a United States Army truck at Waialua, on July 2, 1944. The said injuries caused damage to the brain resulting in total and permanent disability: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of $1,500 shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The excerpt from the report (No. 116), explaining the purposes of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay to the legal guardian of Benjamin A. Ramelb, of Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii, the sum of $68,240 in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Benjamin A. Ramelb arising out of injuries he received when struck by a U.S. Army truck at Waialua on July 2, 1944.

A similar bill for this claimant in the 88th Congress, S. 353, was introduced in the amount of $75,000. In its report on the bill the Department of the Army advised the committee that it would have no objection to the bill if it were amended to pay the amount of $68,240. The bill so amended was approved by this committee, was passed by the Senate on March 17, 1964, and was referred to the House of Representatives. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives favorably reported the bill on August 4, 1964, but no action was taken on it before the adjournment of the 88th Congress.

BENNETT PLACE COMMEMORATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) to provide for Bennett Place commemoration, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, line 9, after the word "on", to strike out "April 24" and insert "April 25"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

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 a proclamation, on or before April 1, 1965, reminding the American people of the spirit of national unity that is symbolized by the Bennett Place, near the city of Durham, North Carolina, and urging those who can do so to attend the commemorative ceremonies to be held by the people of North Carolina at the Bennett Place on April 25, 1965.

SEC. 2. Departments and agencies of the Government of the United States, includ-

ing the Civil War Centennial Commission, are hereby requested to cooperate with the Governor of the State of North Carolina, with other public officers, and with governmental agencies of said State, and with the city of Durham, and the Bennett Place Memorial Commission in planning and carrying out the aforementioned commemorative ceremonies.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The preamble was amended, so as to read:

Whereas a profound spirit of unity among Americans underlies this Nation's greatness; and

Whereas a striking and memorable example of that spirit of unity pervaded the negotiations between General William T. Sherman and General Joseph E. Johnston when those opposing commanders in their search for peace met at the Bennett House, near the city of Durham, North Carolina, in April of 1865; and

Whereas through the diligent and unselfish labors of the Bennett Place Memorial Commission over long years, the Bennett House, together with its grounds and appurtenant buildings, has been carefully preserved and now comprises an official State historic site, administered by the State of North Carolina, so that the Bennett Place today stands as a permanent symbol of the Nation's unity; and

Whereas the people of North Carolina, imbued with the same sense of unity and concord that characterized the Johnston-Sherman Bennett Place conferences a century ago, and wishing to commemorate the centennial of those conferences, will hold appropriate ceremonies at the Bennett Place, near the city of Durham, on April 25, 1965; and

Whereas the Governor of the State of North Carolina, the city of Durham, and Bennett Place Memorial Commission have invited the people of the United States to attend those ceremonies: Therefore be it

The preamble was agreed to.

The excerpt from the report (No. 122), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the joint resolution, as amended, is to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation, on or before April 1, 1965, reminding the American people of the spirit of national unity that is symbolized by the Bennett Place, near the city of Durham, N.C., and urging those who can do so to attend the commemoration ceremonies to be held by the people of North Carolina at the Bennett Place on April 25, 1965.

Bennett Place was originally a small farmhouse, the residence of James Bennett, located on the Hillsboro Road west of Durham, N.C. It was at this small farmhouse, now called the Bennett Place, where Gen. Joseph E. Johnston's Confederate Army surrendered to General William T. Sherman on April 26, 1865, and which was the second and last major stage in the peacemaking process which ended the Civil War.

General Lee's surrender at Appomattox 17 days earlier was the first. The capitulation of Gen. Richard A. Taylor's small force in Alabama a week later and of Kirby Smith's Trans-Mississippi Army at New Orleans exactly a month later concluded the process.

Johnston surrendered by far the largest share of the Confederate troops still in the field at war's end, more than Lee and the others combined. He surrendered all the Confederate forces in the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida and took those States out of the war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar for today.

MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 114, Senate bill 974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 974) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, no action will be taken on the bill this afternoon, but it is anticipated that at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow, the bill will be made the pending business.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed on another subject.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide uniform Federal participation and eligibility standards for benefits payable as medical assistance for the aged under the so-called Kerr-Mills Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and that the bill be permitted to remain at the desk until the close of business on March 22, for the addition of such cosponsors as may desire to join.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 1505) to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide uniform Federal participation and eligibility standards for benefits payable as medical assistance for the aged, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, 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 title I of the Social Security Act is amended as follows:

(1) by striking from section 3(a)(1)(C) the words "the Federal medical percentage (as defined in section 6(c))" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "75 per centum".

(2) by striking from section 3(a)(3) the words "the Federal medical percentage (as defined in section 6(c)" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "75 per centum".

(3) by striking therefrom all of section 6(c).

(4) by amending section 2(a)(11)(D) to read as follows:

"(D) include reasonable standards consistent with the objectives of this title for determining eligibility for and the extent of such assistance, provided that assistance shall include and be limited to:

"(a) Any unmarried applicant whose income, after deduction of medical expenses incurred by the applicant, does not exceed $1,800 annually, or any married applicant and spouse living together whose combined income, after deduction of medical expenses incurred by the applicant and his spouse, does not exceed $2,500: *Provided*, That said $1,800 and $2,500 standards shall be reduced in the case of those States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam whose annual per capita income is less than the annual per capita income of all of the States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam, and shall be increased in the case of those States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam whose annual per capita income is greater than the annual per capita income of all of the States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam. The reduction or increase shall be computed by applying to said dollar standards the percentage which the annual per capita income of a State, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, or Guam bears to the annual per capita income of all of the States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam. The percentages for reduction or increase shall be furnished each State, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by July 1 of each year for application on January 1 of the following year, and shall be based on per capita incomes computed for the most recent calendar year or fiscal year for which such computations can be made with reasonable accuracy.

"(b) 'Income' for the purposes of the preceding subsection shall mean the adjusted gross income computed for Federal income tax purposes plus the amount of capital gain, interest, annuities, or other retirement payments or portions thereof not included in adjusted gross income. In administering this Act, the probable income for the year during which assistance is applied for shall be taken into account so that assistance for which the applicant would probably be qualified when the income for said year is finally determined can be furnished without delay.

"(c) Any unmarried applicant whose resources do not exceed $2,000 ($12,000 if he does not own real property occupied by him as a residence), or any married applicant and spouse living together whose resources do not exceed $3,000 ($13,000 if they do not own real property occupied by them as a residence): *Provided*, That the value of resources shall be the current market value minus any encumbrances against such resource or resources: *And provided further*, That the following resources shall not be taken into account: real property occupied as a residence by the applicant; household goods and furnishings; one automobile, personal effects, and tools necessary for the pursuit of a trade, occupation, or profession; and the cash surrender value of life insurance policies on the life of the applicant or his spouse."

(5) Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this amendment shall take effect July 1, 1965, and paragraph (4) shall take effect July 1, 1966.

Mr. MILLER. The great majority of States now have a medical assistance for

the aged program enacted by their respective State legislatures pursuant to authority conferred in the Kerr-Mills Act. Many of these programs are only getting underway. In some States, including my own State of Iowa, the program is operating fully and very effectively. The fact that these programs are being administered locally by local people who are familiar with the situation and the needs of the people being served is one of the most desirable features. Older people certainly should have the service of people in their community whenever possible.

There are now pending in the Congress a good many bills on the subject of improved medical care for older citizens. Enactment of most of them would add greatly to the complexity of an already complex system of State and Federal laws designed to meet the needs of millions of people. Some of these proposed programs would tend away from rather than toward the local administration concept.

It seems to me that what Congress ought to do is improve upon the Kerr-Mills program—to take advantage of the administrative machinery which has already been set up on the State and local level while at the same time removing some of the defects which have made their appearance during the relatively short time the Kerr-Mills program has been operating. My bill is designed to do so.

The State legislatures are already hard pressed to meet the revenue needs needed to carry out their responsibilities. This is due to the fact that the major sources of raising revenue have been transferred to the Federal Government down through the years. There is much merit to the idea of transferring back to the States a percentage of the Federal revenue collections. Meanwhile, however, it is likely that adequate coverage under the Kerr-Mills program will not be achieved unless the Federal Government provides a larger percentage of the assistance. Under present law this percentage varies from 50 to 80 percent, with most States falling in the 50- and 60-percent area. My bill would provide for a uniform Federal contribution of 75 percent of the cost.

There are no uniform eligibility requirements under the present law, and the variations of standards of financial need enacted by the various States are so great as to cause inequity among our elder citizens. Accordingly, my bill provides for a uniform standard to be used by all of the States—both as to property and as to income. The property qualification makes it clear that certain property cannot be counted, such as a person's home, auto, cash surrender of life insurance, home furnishings, and tools of a trade, business or profession. Additionally, if a person does not own and live in a home, there is an additional $10,000 of property which will be excluded. I believe this additional exclusion in lieu of a private home is needed to do equity among the recipients of this assistance. This provision will remove the criticism which is frequently leveled at the present law that some States can place a lien on a recipient's home and foreclose upon it when he dies.

The income standard is a uniform $1,800 for single persons and $2,500 for a married couple. But in order to recognize the differences in cost of living and standards of living among the various States, this uniform standard would be raised—thus permitting more people to qualify who are in need—where the State's per capita income is higher than that of the national average; and it would be lowered in the case of those States where the per capital income is lower than the national average. The percentage by which there is a variance with the national average would be used as a basis for lowering or raising the $1,800 and $2,500 standard. I might point out that this is the approach now used under the Kerr-Mills law in determining the percentage of the Federal contribution, so the machinery for making the computations is already present.

I wish to emphasize that Senators who supported the Kerr-Mills Act when it passed Congress did not intend any inequities to arise. But in any massive social program affecting millions of our citizens, it is inevitable that inequities will arise. We are still trying to remove inequities from the social security system which went into effect 25 years ago. But it seems to me that when inequities appear, we should try to legislate them away instead of doing away with the program or superimposing some other vast program on top of one that is already on the books.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the Kerr-Mills program is financed out of the general fund of the Treasury into which tax money is largely paid according to relative ability to pay. This is the fairest system of raising revenue we have—and it is much fairer than by imposing a uniform payroll tax on a limited amount of income, which is regressive and bears most heavily on large family, low income groups in the same manner as a sales tax.

My bill, if enacted, will continue the long-established policy of Congress that services provided by the Federal Government, in whole or in part, to meet the health needs of our people should be on a basis of the financial needs of the people who receive them. By continuing to follow this policy, adequate and decent services will be furnished those who need them. Social justice demands nothing more and nothing less.

JOB CORPS MORE ADVANTAGEOUS THAN THREE LOWEST GRADES IN ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a highly illuminating article appeared in the January 27 issue of the Air Force Times.

In clear detail, it underscores that it is more advantageous to be a member of the new Job Corps than to serve as an enlisted man in the three lowest grades in the armed services.

The Air Force Times points out that a member of the Job Corps is paid $80 a month as a trainee and, after 10 months, can make as much as $100 a month.

Additionally, a Job Corps man gets a $75 a year clothing allowance plus a terminal payment of $50 for each month he has served after completion of Corps duty. If he elects, a corpsman may send home each month $25 of the $50 monthly terminal payment and the Government will match it with another $25 a month. Atop this, this money he sends home does not have to go to a dependent, as military allotments must.

In actuality, a corpsman can be earning as much as $125 a month, excluding clothing allowance.

Let is now look at the person who enlists or is drafted into the service. I quote from the article:

> The man entering military service gets $78 a month. He can get an allotment only if he has dependents for whom he supplies at least half of their support. After 4 months of service, his base pay goes up to $83.20 a month. During his first 2 years of service, even if he rises to the rank of E–3, he will get only $99.37 a month.

The article pointedly examines the recruiting material provided Job Corps men which tells them:

> The purpose is to help you get and keep a good job, maybe return to school, or join the Army or Navy.

And as the article concluded, "if they do join the Army, Navy, or Air Force; they will have to take a pay cut."

Mr. President, this is a sorry state of affairs when the men electing to serve their Nation in the Armed Forces are paid less than those who will serve in the Job Corps.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Trainees in Poverty Corps Higher Paid Than Recruits," be printed in the RECORD. Also on the same subject is a timely article appearing in the current issue of Reader's Digest, entitled "Paupers in Uniform"; and an editorial appearing in the February 17 issue of the Chicago Tribune, entitled "More Expensive Than Radcliffe," which I ask be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Air Force Times, Jan. 27, 1965]

TRAINEES IN POVERTY CORPS HIGHER PAID THAN RECRUITS

WASHINGTON.—The 40,000 unemployed, unskilled youths who will be enrolled for training in the first year of the war on poverty Job Corps program will be better paid than recruits in the armed services.

This was revealed as Job Corps headquarters announced that the first 30 corpsmen were beginning their training at an old depression days Civilian Conservation Corps site in Maryland.

The Job Corpsman is paid $80 a month. The military recruit gets only $78 a month.

Here is the situation for the corpsmen: They will get $30 monthly for spending money. When they complete their service they will get a terminal payment of $50 for each month they spend in the Corps.

After 7 months' training, a corpsman may qualify for the rank of assistant leader. If he does, he will get a $10 monthly raise. If, after 10 months, he makes the rank of leader he will get another $10 raise. So he can, in 10 months, be making $100 a month. In addition to this he gets a $75-a-year clothing allowance.

If he wishes, he may send home each month $25 of his $50 monthly terminal payment. If

he does, the Government will match it with another $25 a month. The money does not have to be allotted to a dependent, as military allotments must be.

So the corpsman who makes leader can be earning (not counting the clothing allowance) $125 month in monthly pay, terminal payments, and in allotments.

The man entering military service gets $78 a month. He can get an allotment only if he has dependents for whom he supplies at least half of their support. After 4 months of service his base pay goes up to $83.20 a month. During his first 2 years of service, even if he rises to the rank of E–3, he will get only $99.37 a month.

Rates for enlisted men with less than 2 years' service has not been changed in 13 years. Both the enlisted man and the Job Corps men get free medical and dental care, housing, and food.

The Job Corps man gets job-finding help when he leaves the corps.

The Job Corps was set up to aid young people from the ages of 16 through 21 who are largely unemployable because they lack education and job skills. Most have not completed high school and their reading and arithmetic skills range from the 4th to the 7th grade levels.

About 40,000 young men and women will be enrolled the first year and 100,000 in the second year of the program. They will go to centers in rural areas where they are given training in a number of skills and do useful conservation work.

Recruiting folders given Job Corps men tell them that "the purpose is to help you get and keep a good job * * * maybe return to school * * * or join the Army or Navy."

If they do join the Army, Navy, or Air Force, they'll have to take a pay cut.

[From the Reader's Digest, March 1965]

PAUPERS IN UNIFORM

(By Francis and Katharine Drake)

A job for Congress: revise the military pay scale upward. The present low-wage policy damages the morale and effectiveness of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen; it also causes constant turnover of personnel, thus wasting the taxpayers' money.

The President's initiation of a crusade against poverty recently brought to light the plight of uncounted numbers of citizens who, at a time of unprecedented national prosperity, are unable to keep their heads above the financial disaster level. This spring the Nation is in for another shock, when the subject of military pay increases comes before Congress. The American people will then get a good hard look at a situation that must fill all but the thickest skinned citizen with a sense of shame: the financial plight of the men who protect our country.

The fact is that thousands of American enlisted men on active duty, skilled volunteers who wear their country's uniform with pride, are actually paupers in uniform. It is ironic that the Government, which established poverty levels, is itself paying many of its uniformed men below these levels. Some soldiers, sailors, and airmen and their families are even being forced to accept relief.

The Air Force, with 719,000 enlisted men and women, has just completed a survey and found (the figures can be tripled to get very rough totals for all services):

(a) 5,000 Air Force men have received relief benefits.

(b) 55,000 more are technically eligible for relief but too proud to accept it.

(c) 169,000 receive basic pay below the Government poverty levels.

(d) 148,000 men are moonlighting in their meager spare time.

(e) 180,000 Air Force wives work to support the family.

It is a fact that a jet pilot, master of the skills involved in maneuvering supersonic planes, actually draws less pay than a Pentagon messenger.

LOST INVESTMENT

Former Senator Kenneth Keating described the pay situation as "a disgraceful reward for those who have sworn to defend our country." More than this, the low pay scale represents a great waste of the taxpayers' money. When poverty forces the majority of highly skilled men out of the services after their first hitch, the result is a perpetual turnover. The Government is committed to the tremendous cost of training new men who, in turn, will walk out. The total investment cost of training just one Air Force radar electronic specialist is $23,000; a ballistic-missile launch officer, $49,140; a B–52 commander, $1,400,000; his crew, another $2 million. When these men quit, all that investment goes down the drain.

Between 60 and 70 percent of all Air Force skilled enlisted men leave at the end of their first 4-year enlistment. Also, an average of 54 percent of the officers separate at the earliest permitted date. In the past 5 years Army resignations have increased by more than 50 percent, Air Force by 137 percent.

IN THE RED

The case history of Joe Doakes, high school graduate, age 19, comes closer to the rule than to the exception. Joe, motivated by patriotism, challenge, the promise of a fine technical education, begins his 4-year hitch as airman basic—pay, $78 a month, living in barracks with no allowances. Three years later he is Airman First Class Doakes, now a skilled electronics specialist, earning $194 a month plus allowances, married, father of one child, expecting another—and in debt up to his ears. How, in 3 brief years, did Joe land himself in such a financial fix? The answer of course is: by marriage. (Our armed services today total 2,700,000 men in uniform, wives number about 1,500,000.)

Ineligible because of lack of rank for base housing, he now receives $83 quarters allowance from the Government. Cheapest off-base lodgings he can find cost $107 a month, not including utilities, which average $30 a month more. Furnishing the apartment sets him back nearly $1,000. Commuting to base involves a secondhand car; repair and gas bills cost him $24 a month. During the last 3 years Joe has had to move twice—and pay the family transportation costs each time. Government food allowance is $31.50 a month, or roughly 10 cents per person per meal for the three Doakeses. Total pay, including all allowances, is $308 a month.

It boils down to this: The Doakes' monthly budget invariably balances in the red. Whenever he can, Joe moonlights, but unpredictable duty hours make spare-time work irregular. The services, perpetually short of skilled men, are forced to hire civilian technical representatives from private industry. Joe works alongside one of these, performing a duplicate job. The technical representative earns $1,000 a month (plus generous overtime). Having spent $25,120 on Joe's training, the Air Force now presses him to reenlist, offering a $779 re-up bonus. The technical representative tells him not to be fool.

THOUSANDS OF JOES

This is the sort of choice faced by thousands of young service couples each year. On the one side, pride, patriotism, the hope of promotion; on the other, more money, shorter hours, higher living, the freedom to change jobs if opportunity beckons.

Joe's decision? "I'm quitting," he says. "Not because I want to, but because I just can't afford to stay in."

Multiply Joe by hundreds of thousands of men in each service: It adds up to billions of dollars a year wasted in unnecessary turnover—and a threat to our protective strength and the safety of our country. As Capt. William A. Golden states in the Naval Institute Proceedings: "It is now necessary to recognize objectively that officers (and enlisted men) cannot be paid like busboys, worked like field hands and released like old, slow halfbacks—it simply is not good business."

Today, our military are in danger of becoming forgotten men. The economy is leaving them so far behind that it is small wonder they are becoming disillusioned and embittered, unwilling to put up any longer with the status of second-class citizens. Many will settle for less pay than they can get in industry, for the privilege of serving their country—but not if they are going to be penalized for marrying young, and driven to live on charity handouts.

How can we make a military career attractive to the youth of America? The services, in mutual consultation, have defined the minimum improvements they believe necessary.

Basic pay: The study proposes an immediate pay increase of 16 percent for enlisted men with less than 2 years' service, 15 percent for officers with less than 2 year's service, plus increases for other officers and enlisted men, plus a redefinition of subsistence allowances for those who cannot eat on base. (There was a military pay raise only last year, but of only 2½ percent—of virtually no benefit to the lower ranks who needed it most.) The proposed increases would average from $12 to $44 a month for enlisted men, from $37 to $111 for officers. By contrast, raises granted last year to civilian Federal employees were five times as high.

Promotion: This is a major grievance among servicemen, since, at present, a promotion with accompanying pay increase is by no means automatically granted when a man becomes eligible. Restrictions on the services' authority to promote enlisted men deny deserved promotions. As a result, some highly qualified lower grade enlisted men are doing sergeants' work but receiving neither sergeants' stripes nor sergeants' pay.

Quarters: Housing has long been acknowledged by Congress to be part of military pay. Quarters, moreover, are supposed to be on-base, so that personnel are readily available in case of emergency. This commitment has never been properly honored. Below the rank of sergeant, virtually no serviceman is able to live on base if he is married. Instead, like the Doakes, hundreds of thousands of young service families dwell in civilian quarters, some adequate, some miserably substandard. Rent gouging in the vicinity of military bases is commonplace.

The services' proposal is to adjust basic quarters allowances to a more realistic amount. This is a stopgap. What is really needed is adequate base housing—which would cost the Government less in the long run.

A cure lies in renewing the Capehart housing bill, which expired last year. That bill permitted the military to have houses built on base, or next to it, by civilian contractors; to borrow the cost from private lenders on FHA-secured 20-year mortgages; and to pay these off out of congressional appropriations. The mortgage cost on a $17,500 unit is actually less than the average amount now paid out for a serviceman's quarters allowance—and the Government ends by owning the house free and clear. While the Government cannot build all the 350,000 units needed, it can and should build more than the 3,000 at present under construction.

But even with adequate housing, military paychecks can never compete with the wages of private industry. A petty officer in charge of the reactor aboard the cruiser *Long Beach* earns $453 a month. His civilian counterpart aboard the *Savannah* rates $1,200.

Privileges: These represent the compensating factors that traditionally bridge the gaps.

Among them—counted as a part of service pay for 99 years—is the right to shop in commissaries, where the military can buy food at cost plus a surcharge of 3 percent. Well stocked at one time, post stores nowadays have only a quarter of the items available at supermarkets, operate only 40 hours a week, carry no "specials," no fancy items, and have long waiting lines; but savings amount roughly to $400 a year per family of four—a sum of critical importance.

A questionnaire recently circulated among 176,000 men in uniform reveals that 50 percent more enlisted men and 30 percent more officers would be obliged to leave the service if post shopping facilities were withdrawn and the $400 savings denied. Loss to the Government on commissary transactions amounts to roughly $40 a year per family, a sizable sum overall. But as Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, points out: An increase of one-tenth of 1 percent in the reenlistment rate would more than cancel out this Government red ink.

Also, the Department of Defense has acknowledged that any attempt to replace commissary savings with a pay raise would "greatly exceed the Government cost in operating base stores." Constant attacks on these and other privileges—base clubs, movies, etc., run by the men themselves at no cost to the Government—tend to make men quit in disgust. Anything that injures the military esprit de corps costs the Nation dearly.

NEEDED: GOOD MEN

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's determination to run his Department as efficiently as a business has been much in the headlines. He has shown courage and ingenuity in saving nearly $3 billion from our defense bill. Yet, in the words of Adm. David McDonald, the Chief of Naval Operations: "No other business in the world leans so heavily on manpower as does the military." Good hardware is of little use without good men.

The cost of the raise in pay and allowances for all services, proposed in the military services' study, is $811 million a year. Against this, savings would be realized. Pay and maintenance of our 2,700,000 men is about $15 billion a year; if, by retention of experienced men, the total manpower requirement could be reduced by only 10 percent, the savings would exceed the pay raise by far.

In the last analysis, the hope for the military lies in the understanding and support of the public, whose welfare is directly concerned. To give servicemen the stepchild treatment is to tamper recklessly with the innermost fabric of military security. If through indifference we cast loose the ablest and most skilled fighting men in the world, our future is indeed in jeopardy.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Feb. 17, 1965]

MORE EXPENSIVE THAN RADCLIFFE

It costs about $3,000 a year to send a girl to Radcliffe or one of the other leading colleges for women. If you think this is expensive, look at the $7,620 which it will cost to maintain a girl at one of the new Job Corps centers of the Johnson administration's anti-poverty program.

Contracts totaling $8½ million have been awarded by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity [OEO] for the opening of the first three centers in Los Angeles, Cleveland, and St. Petersburg, Fla. They will have facilities for 875 girls from 18 to 21.

The groups operating the centers will receive $530 a month to feed, house, and give instruction to each girl. In addition, the OEO will give each girl and her family an allowance of $105 a month. These costs total $635 a month, or $7,620 a year. The OEO also will pay transportation costs, estimated at $75 to $100 per girl.

Similar Job Corps centers are being established for boys. The largest is to be at the abandoned military base at Camp Kilmer, N.J., for which $11½ million has been allotted. Other large centers will be at San Marcos, Tex., and at Astoria, Oreg. The Texas center will be operated by Southwest Texas State College, President Johnson's alma mater. Eighteen smaller centers will be set up in rural areas of 15 States.

The trainees at all these centers will be mostly school dropouts whose families are considered "economically deprived." Efforts will be made to give them basic education and training for jobs, which will help them to become self-supporting.

The idea for the centers has grown out of proposals to reestablish the Civilian Conservation Corps camps which were operated from 1933 to 1942 to help young men who could not find jobs. The Corps did much useful conservation work in State and national parks and it drew much less criticism than the other New Deal "make work" agencies. The CCC camps also were useful in training Army Reserve officers who served as administrators. The cost of operating the camps was less than $1,000 a year per trainee.

Much of the trainees in the new Job Corps centers will do no useful work, but will spend all their time receiving instruction which should have been given to them in the schools. The average cost of maintaining a child in high school in the United States is about $500 a year.

The amount is dirt cheap compared with the $7,620 a year to maintain a girl in the new Job Corps centers.

ADDRESS BY DONALD E. JOHNSON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE LOS ANGELES CIVIC LUNCHEON

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the national commander of the American Legion, Donald E. Johnson, delivered an outstanding address before the Los Angeles, Calif., Civic Luncheon on January 5, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AN ADDRESS BY DONALD E. JOHNSON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE LOS ANGELES CIVIC LUNCHEON, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., JANUARY 5, 1965

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, my fellow American Legionnaires, ladies and gentlemen, I have been here in California for nearly a week now, and among your many other talents and accomplishments I must say that you certainly know how to welcome the New Year.

This opportunity to appear before a blue ribbon audience such as comprises the Los Angeles Civic Luncheon Club has long been regarded by national commanders of the American Legion as one of the true highlights of their term of office. Now that I am here, I can understand why.

On behalf of my 2,600,000 fellow American Legionnaires may I express our sincere appreciation for your presence, and my personal appreciation to all who have helped to make this visit such a memorable one.

This is the traditional season of the year for new expressions of faith and of hope, and the American Legion takes this opportunity to reaffirm its faith in the ability and willingness of the American people to determine their own destiny, and the hope that this year may see remarkable strides toward the realization of that destiny.

The American Legion does not believe we are going to make any substantial progress toward this objective by further coddling of the international Communist conspiracy, and we do not believe that new concessions to the Reds will further the cause of world peace—certainly not peace with honor.

Very rarely do I put a title on any message which I bring on behalf of the American Legion, but if my remarks of today should have such a title I think it might appropriately be called "Myth-ful Thinking."

International affairs and U.S. foreign policy command a major share of time and space of the Nation's news media and well they should, because of the continuing irreconcilable conflict between free world interests and objectives and those of the Communist world.

In recent months a great deal of space has been devoted to the reporting of divergent views as to which policies the United States should pursue to most effectively advance the interests and attain the objectives of the free world.

Expression of dissident viewpoints is an expected and desirable feature of the American scene. Thus, it is quite normal for the American Legion to listen closely when the subject is our national security and the voice is that of a high Government official. East-West relations generally, and U.S. policies toward Communist countries in particular, are of paramount concern to American Legionnaires.

It should come as no surprise to this audience, I'm sure, to hear that the American Legion finds itself in basic disagreement with much of what Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT said in his "Bridges East and West" speech in Dallas, Tex., last month.

We have the utmost respect for the Senator personally and for the powerful position he occupies as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Yet, we feel impelled to record our strong dissent from his thesis that the road to peace with communism lies across "bridges of accommodation."

The Senator visualizes these bridges as spanning a chasm of misunderstanding, and would involve accommodations which he feels should include compromises that respect the vital interests of the Communists.

The American Legion offers no apologies for the hard line it takes toward communism. The Communists have written their own record of deceit and treachery and any chasm which exists between East and West is of the Communists' own making.

Any bridge can span a chasm, but any bridge that is built to serve a useful purpose must have good approaches from either side, and we see nothing in either the historical or the current record of communism to indicate any interest in building a constructive approach to the proposed "bridges of accommodation."

As we interpret the Senator's preliminary remarks, his thesis is based on the five following negative assumptions:

1. The West cannot win the cold war.
2. In the political realm, at least, man is incapable of deciding the best course for man to follow.
3. Realization of the opportunities created by victory in war is beyond man's inherent powers.
4. The nature of war and its effect on men precludes a peace settlement based on reason and justice, and,
5. American idealism is too virtuous for its own good and, therefore, must not be permitted to stand in the way of our getting along with the Communists.

Any policy based on such assumptions would be devoid of hope for the future and would lead to the ultimate conclusion that

this country has no choice but—and I quote Mr. FULBRIGHT—"to build bridges to the Communist world and in so doing to influence the course which it follows in a direction compatible with our own safety."

It would seem to suggest that we adopt the philosophy: "If we can't beat 'em, join 'em." My friends, where communism is involved, the American Legion is not now willing, nor will it ever be willing to endorse such a policy on the part of the United States. Further, we believe the vast majority of the American people would rise in opposition to such a policy.

Senator FULBRIGHT, it must be stated, did concede that the building of bridges to the Communist world would not result in the early resolution of the more fundamental differences between East and West.

Also, he said that "accommodations with the Communist world can be only one part of the grand strategy of American national security." The other two bases which he mentioned are, "the maintenance of the world's most powerful nuclear deterrent force and the maintenance and sustenance of a vigorous Atlantic Alliance."

The American Legion is in complete accord with these latter two points.

Advocacy of a second-to-none deterrent force has been an American Legion trademark throughout our organizational existence. The American Legion was among the earliest proponents of a NATO alliance and has remained one of its stanch supporters.

May I suggest that if bridges are to be built—or repaired—that we concentrate our efforts on those bridges between America and her allies and that those efforts be focused immediately upon the salvation and strengthening of the Atlantic Alliance. It is no secret that a part of our difficulties with our European friends lies in the fact that, too often, we have neglected them in negotiating with the Soviet leaders.

If the United States is to assume the role of bridge builder, let's build those bridges which we might reasonably expect to have usable approaches from both sides and which will be open to two-way traffic.

The history of negotiation with Communist nations does not indicate that further accommodation on our part will reduce the Communist appetite for expansion, as Senator FULBRIGHT suggests. Indeed, the exact opposite is true and Laos is a case in point. There the Communists contend they are entitled to occupy territory formerly under neutralist control because the neutralists now are cooperating with pro-Western factions. This false interpretation of the 1962 compromise studiously ignores the fact that the recent political realinement in Laos resulted from a renewal of Communist aggression.

One positive assumption which the Senator advanced in support of his thesis is that "the Communist countries are susceptible to external influence and to internal change."

We agree that Communist countries are susceptible to external influence, but we believe that a resolute stand on our part would be far more likely to influence the Communists to abandon their imperialistic designs than would a conciliatory policy.

We agree that internal change is possible in Communist countries, but only to the extent that such change will serve the purposes of Communist leaders.

The Senator suggests that we intensify the policy of the present administration to treat different Communist countries differently in the belief that this will help break up the Communist bloc. Specifically, he urges: friendly cooperation with Yugoslavia; restoration of full diplomatic relations with Hungary, and encouragement of increased trade with Rumania. The American Legion is opposed to each such move on the part of our Government.

As for Poland, the Senator would continue our present overly favorable concessions to the Polish Communist regime, but in this instance he believes "that no new initiatives are in order for the time being." In the Senator's own words Poland has "regressed * * * toward more passive acceptance of Soviet leadership." In our words, what the Senator is saying is that the policy which he advocates for other Communist countries was a failure in Poland.

When the Senator speaks of varying degrees of independence of the satellite countries from the domination of Moscow, he is speaking of the puppet governments and not of a degree of independence or liberty of the people themselves. The American Legion would like nothing better than to help materially the people of all Communist dominated countries, but we do not believe that making concessions to their current masters will achieve the objective of restoring to the people the right to a government of their own choosing.

If we are indeed in the business of exploding old myths and exploring and acting upon new realities, as the Senator suggested in a speech on the floor of the Senate last March, I think we can explode the myth that the Red satellites of Eastern Europe are becoming more free to pursue their own destinies.

We should like to see the example of the possibility where, in any one of those unfortunate nations, it can reasonably be anticipated that the liberties of the people will be restored or that the government involved may become alined with the West.

Imagine, if you will, the fate of the freedom fighters should there be another uprising of patriots in Hungary or in any of the other satellite nations. Show us the example of a pro-Western vote by the enlightened Government of Yugoslavia in the United Nations. Show us the tendency of the new leaders of the Soviet Union to be more moderate and reasonable in their policies toward the Western World. How can we interpret the Kremlin's unqualified support of the Congo rebels, and the groundless condemnation of our humanitarian rescue effort, as moderate and reasonable overtures?

The cold, hard facts of life in the international arena fully explode the myth that our salvation lies along the route of accommodation, and mythful thinking will solve none of our problems.

Another myth suggested in that earlier speech before the Senate was the theory that the United States should accept the continued existence of the Castro regime in Cuba as a "distasteful nuisance," but not a threat except to other nations of the hemisphere.

It is the contention of the American Legion that a threat to one is a threat to all and that the security of the Western Hemisphere cannot be considered as a piecemeal arrangement. We believe the existence of a Communist government in the Western Hemisphere is inconsistent with the best interests of the United States, and a formidable threat not only to the United States but to the entire free world.

As reluctant as was official Washington to accept the cold reality of the Russian missile buildup in Cuba just a little more than 2 years ago, the fact remains that it did happen. The fact also remains that we have had no on-the-scene inspection to insure that all offensive missiles were removed. All the evidence indicates that the puppet strings by which Red Cuba is manipulated are controlled from Moscow. The "distasteful nuisance," which Castro alone might be, thus becomes a real and present menace when the power behind the puppet is realistically revealed.

Finally, in a news conference following his December 8 speech in Dallas, the Senator is reported to have expressed the view that involvement of Americans in a stepped-up war in Vietnam would be a "senseless effort," and that our aid program there should not have been undertaken in the first place.

The American Legion takes the opposite view and has pledged its approval and support of "increased commitment of American forces and full employment of those military measures which promise early and complete destruction of the forces of aggression—both at the places of their attacks and at their sources of power as military judgment decided—in an effort not only to preserve freedom in Southeast Asia but also as a part of our worldwide commitments to the defense of freedom against Communist aggression."

The American Legion believes, and by convention resolution has expressed the opinion, that the United States should explore the real possibilities of encouraging "the establishment of and to recognize and support a democratic Cuban government-in-exile."

The American Legion believes that if bridges are to be built they should be built in the direction of our free world allies to strengthen the understandings and cement the alliances which provide the best hope for thwarting the Communist dream of world conquest.

We believe that most Americans will agree with our positions on these vital issues. The course we advocate is not an easy one. It calls for faith, firmness and the facing of reality, yet we believe that in the defense of freedom there can be no compromise.

ENTRENCHMENT OF WELFARE STATE ON AMERICAN LIFE AND OUTLOOK

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a most persuasive and penetrating editorial was published in the Wall Street Journal of March 9, 1965.

More importantly, it contains a warning that many of us should heed: The slow but sure entrenchment of the welfare state in American life and outlook.

It details how the welfare-subsidy mentality pervades the message of the President of the United States. It underscores that:

> At every turn, almost every day, come these fresh proposals for sheltering the individual, for ruthlessly degrading the value of working and sacrificing and daring.

Many thoughtful citizens fear that one day, perhaps sooner than we think, all of us will wake up to find that we no longer have any say over our daily lives; that we have turned over to the Federal Government the initiative upon which this Nation was built.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "The Welfare of the Future," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WELFARE OF THE FUTURE

If any doubts remain that President Johnson intends to build a full-fledged welfare state, they should be dispelled by the accumulation of messages he is sending Congress. The plans go farther and faster than many of last fall's voters, bemused by thoughts on the President as perhaps somewhat conservative, could very well have considered likely.

Even those who welcome a welfare state as a kind of nebulous abstraction may be a bit abashed. In a sense we all want such a state, and to a large extent individual initiative, long relatively free of autocratic restrictions, has created a private welfare state.

What has to be considered about a publicly subsidized welfare state, in contrast, is not only the nature of the bounties proposed but also the unprecedented federalization of American life they entail. For the administration formula goes far beyond the traditional handouts to bigtime farmers, the aids to various other industries and to small business generally.

In addition to all of that, we now have plans for massive new Federal educational grants and loans, from construction to scholarships to textbook buying, implicitly denying the right of individuals and private institutions to make their own way. Federal camps to keep some youths away from the streets and their responsibilities. Medicare, a probable harbinger of Federal medical programs for all. A long step toward Federal administration of multistate regions like so-called Appalachia. New Federal interventions in the arts and humanities.

A particularly revealing insight into the welfare-subsidy mentality occurs in the President's new housing program. The proposal in question is for the Government to provide "rent supplements for families across a wide range of lower and moderate income brackets so they can afford decent housing."

As this idea is being interpreted, the actual housing would be built by private groups or nonprofit companies, with middle-income occupants paying 20 or 25 percent of their incomes for rent. The Federal Government would supply the landlords the difference between that amount and whatever would constitute an economic rent.

Now the definition of "middle income," like the definition of a true "poverty line," is debatable. But by any definition people of middle incomes, even if they are elderly and live in substandard housing, are not derelicts or irresponsibles or those whom unavoidable misfortune has laid completely low. For the most part they are, instead, people who have managed to make out so far. Are they the proper objects of subsidy?

Moreover, when the National Government furnishes direct payments to help individual families with so basic an item as rent (albeit there is dubious precedent in the farm programs), we would say it is establishing a relationship much too personal for comfort.

In view of that kind of intrusion, it is perhaps not surprising that the same housing message calls for a "temporary" national commission on urban codes, zoning and the like—which certainly sounds like incipient federalization of typically local responsibilities. Much more in the way of unhealthy intimacy can be found throughout the Presidential messages.

We recognize that the twin trends, expanding subsidies and expanding federalization, have long roots and are now being carried forward toward their inherently logical conclusions. We also concede that to do so is considered smart politics, especially when it is possible at the same time to appear friendly to the business community by the simple expedient of not setting out to trample it.

Finally, we suppose the administration would be more restrained did it not expect the people's representatives in Congress to go along with much of its welfare-subsidy state. In criticizing the administration, then, we are perforce criticizing all of us who have been too weak or apathetic or otherwise unavailing throughout all the years of developing Federal sprawl.

Still, there is irony, and not a little poignancy, in the rapidly advancing national state. It is all clothed in the rhetoric of the Great Society. Yet it is hard to imagine a morally shabbier society than one in which group after new group is encouraged to suck at one or more Federal subsidies, with all the individual debasement that implies.

Only the other day the President was telling young people they have to "work and sacrifice and dare" as members of the Great Society; they are living in the wrong generation if they want a sheltered and uneventful life. Yet at every turn, almost every day, come these fresh proposals for sheltering the individual, for ruthlessly degrading the value of working and sacrificing and daring.

That may be the most regrettable part: The young people now being so powerfully molded in a Federal pattern, with less and less chance to know the virtues and rewards of self reliance. Let us at least reflect that with their indoctrination the future welfare of free American institutions is also being inevitably fashioned.

THE SOYBEAN INDUSTRY—A SUCCESS STORY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, if anyone needs an example of a "success" story, he need only look to the soybean industry.

From 1946 to 1964, soybean production has risen from 203,395,000 bushels to 699 million bushels. In another 10 years, predicts one of the foremost spokesmen for the industry, Glenn H. Pogeler of Mason City, Iowa, production could reach the astronomical rate of 1.5 billion bushels.

Mr. Pogeler, in a speech delivered in Greenville, Miss., last January 29, confidently forecasts that his industry will find markets for this increased production. I do not doubt this. Since the Soybean Council of America was formed in 1956, exports of soybeans and soybean products have increased by 235 percent. In 1956, the total export value stood at $217.8 million; this had risen to $727 million by 1963–64. This is a remarkable and enviable record.

Because I believe this story merits the attention of all, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Pogeler's address before the Tri-State Soybean Forum in Greenville, Miss., be printed in the RECORD.

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

GLENN H. POGELER, SPEECH, TRISTATE SOYBEAN FORUM, GREENVILLE, MISS., JANUARY 29, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to appear before the Ninth Annual Tri-state Soybean Forum here in Greenville, Miss. I thank you for inviting me. Your forum reminds me of another forum because just 5 weeks ago, I stood at the site of the ancient Roman Forum in Rome from where world trade was once controlled. We now have a worldwide market for soybeans.

Are you interested in doubling the production of soybeans by 1975? Would you like to take a bigger role in the fastest growing agricultural industry in the United States since 1930? You have already contributed much to this fantastic story, but I believe "you ain't seen nothing yet."

Let me briefly review what has taken place during a short period of less than 20 years. I promise you I did not come here today to bore you with facts, figures and dry statistics. Nevertheless, I must give you a tiny dose of statistics to freshen your mind on what has taken place in this short span of time.

First, let's talk about soybean production:

SOYBEANS PRODUCED

In 1946, 203,395,000 bushels; 1956, 449,251,000 bushels; 1964, 699 million bushels.

These figures alone point up a tremendous accomplishment by the farmers of this country. Where else in the world has this happened? How are we going to double by 1975? Here is how I think the job can be done:

1. Employing more acres of land. We have many idle acres and they can be put to work if need be.

2. Increased yields per acre. Now how will we do that? I suggest a number of ways:

(a) Better varieties.

(b) By soybean breeding research in finding a way to get soybeans to respond to direct fertilizer applications.

(c) Narrow row plantings.

(d) Better weed control, both chemical and mechanical.

(e) Using chemicals on plants to increase pod set and more soybeans per plant.

These projects alone or combined make for a man-sized job ahead.

SOYBEAN OIL PRODUCTION

In 1946, 1,454 million pounds; 1956, 3,200 million pounds; 1964, 5,100 million pounds.

Ninety percent of all soybean oil produced is now going into such products as margarine, shortening, salad oil, and cooking oil. The balance of 10 percent is going into industrial uses and refining uses. The U.S. market is still the No. 1 consumer. We must continue to expand this market. The U.S. industry is doing an excellent job of promoting the sale and is constantly upgrading the products.

SOYBEAN MEAL PRODUCTION

In 1946, 4,086,000 tons; 1956, 7,509,000 tons; 1964, 10,608,000 tons.

The demand generated by World War II food needs made it absolutely necessary that we increase on an explosion basis our protein supplies. Well, we did it with soybean meal; you all know the story.

In this Nation we literally have all kinds of meat sticking out of our ears. Poultry, beef, pork, turkeys, lamb, commercial fish production—you name it. What a success story in a hungry world.

Now let's talk about the soybean council and my subject, "Market Opportunities for Soybeans and Soybean Products." This part of my story covers the U.S. and oversea market.

About 10 years ago, Howard Roach, who is now chairman of the board and who hopes to retire in less than a year, along with other growers and processors, had the foresight and vision to see the tremendous potential in soybeans as the miracle crop. The Soybean Council of America was formed by the growers, processors, handlers, exporters, and others were invited who had an interest in the crop.

Since the soybean council was formed in 1956, the exports of soybeans and soybean products have increased by 235 percent. In 1956 the total export value stood at $217.8 million and by 1963–64 had risen to $727 million. These sales include dollar items and do not include donations.

The council contracts on a yearly basis to engage in market research, promotion, and development of oversea demand for soybeans and soybean products. We also help to promote other U.S. oilseeds if the foreign users have an interest. Our major emphasis for the last year or so has been on soybean oil which has been in a surplus category for some time. In spite of a fast growing demand domestically and a tremendous increase in oversea usage, our processing industry has been able to keep ahead of total usage. Just in the last 12 months have we been able to draw down stocks at a fairly rapid rate.

The council has been in operation since 1956 in the oversea market, and has recently evaluated its program and made some changes in its structure. We now have offices at Madrid, Hamburg, Brussels, Casablanca, Cairo, Ankara, Teheran, Karachi, New Delhi, and Bogatá in South America.

We have plans to open an office at Chittagong in east Pakistan.

Our operation is financed in two ways—the Washington, D.C., office, staff, travel, and all domestic expenses are paid for in dollars which are collected from growers, processors, soybean handlers, exporters, and other trade interests.

Overseas we use foreign currency which has been received by the U.S. Government in exchange for surplus farm commodities sold under the Public Law 480 program. This program is now called the food-for-peace program.

These funds are contracted by us through Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Rules and regulations are drawn up as to the authorized use of the funds and we work c osely with FAS.

We also contract with industry and trade groups overseas to participate in our activities. They furnish money and manpower. These groups are called third-party cooperators. We have a number of projects going in countries where we have offices and also operate in quite a number of countries where we do not have a local office. The matching funds and programs are required under the terms of our contracts with Foreign Agricultural Service.

Our program consists of market research, demand studies, country statistics, using trade fairs, newspaper and magazine advertising, radio, recipe books, cooking demonstrations, symposiums and other media. All of these are used to expand the oversea market demand.

The oil promotion campaign has been directed to the oil-short areas such as the Mediterranean countries, the Middle East, Asia and South America. The per capita consumption of fats and oils in many countries is very low.

Soybeans are promoted in countries having a processing industry and where market demands exist for all of the processed products.

Demand for soybean meal is growing and we furnish much information on the nutritional qualities of soybean meal and on quality controls to many interested people.

Now for a few success stories before we wind up with some projections for the future.

The soybean council can point with pride to a number of success stories and the list grows as we receive marketing experience. We are fortunate in having a crop to sell that receives such a ready acceptance in the world. Nevertheless, commodities do not sell themselves and it takes more than an order book to successfully complete a sale. Proper processing, packaging, shipping, delivery and sales follow-up are all essentials to a satisfied customer.

As a starter let's use Spain as an example. When they began to buy oil from the United States, it all moved in barrels. Barrels, drumming and handling all cost money. Rotating stocks too is a problem. We assisted Spain in setting up bulk handling facilities. This has resulted in a considerable savings to the Spanish Government and trade. Savings of $20 to $30 per ton have resulted in switching from drummed shipments to bulk handling. Much technical assistance has been furnished by the United States and this results in more volume of business and better quality products.

We also offer the services of U.S. technicians to the refiner, packers, and handlers of soybean oil in Spain and other countries. As the quality of the product in the hands of consumers improves, so does local consumption.

Spain bought oil under Public Law 480 for a number of years, but now is our largest dollar customer.

In Germany we have supplied information on proper processing of soybean meal so that the crushers have been able to put out a much improved meal. Germany is the second largest importer of U.S. soybeans taking in 28,644,000 bushels last year.

In Japan, the American Soybean Association has conducted programs for a number of years. The result: Japan is the largest importer of U.S. soybeans, taking 45 million bushels last year. The American Soybean Association has used all the promotional devices available in Japan and the results speak for themselves.

I can repeat the story for almost every country in which we work, but let me give you one or two more examples and then move on to my predictions for the future.

How about the newest country to order soybean oil in quantity? I am now directing your attention to India.

India within a few days, will be unloading at Bombay the first 8,000 tons of approximately 75,000 tons of soybean oil which they will take in by midsummer. This oil will be used to produce Vanaspati which is the basic product for India. If the logjam there can be broken, we expect India to eventually become a large consumer of U.S. fats and oil. Four hundred and eighty million people growing in number at the rate of 2½ percent per year make a tremendous potential market. Are we going to make the best of this opportunity? It's up to us, but I assure you, this is no easy job. We have a real money problem here along with many others. India is desperately short of dollars and has to carefully control its money to make the best use of it. Along with the No. 1 problem of money are religious customs, eating habits, lack of handling facilities, a need for new knowledge in the refining and formulation of products. All of these problems are not solved overnight. We are furnishing technicians and expect to have our two oil technicians there when the first shipment arrives. Don't expect miracles, but we will do our best.

We have other stories along this line, but I believe it is time to move on to my projections for the future.

First, let's talk about soybeans which are your No. 1 interest here today.

I am projecting a rapid increase in production and would like to throw a crop of 1,500 million bushels in 1975 at you for your consideration. I am saying double the crop in 10 years. Is this too optimistic? I don't think so. If I am too high by 100 or 200 million, I can still point with pride to a terrific accomplishment.

You can produce the soybeans, but you are going to have to do a number of things:

1. Increase acreage by about 60 percent.
2. Increase yields up to 30 bushels per acre.
3. Net results: 50 million acres of beans times 30 bushels per acre equals 1,500 million bushels. Simple, isn't it? I believe you can do it, but how? By:
1. Better varieties.
2. Closer plantings.
3. Better weed control.
4. New chemicals to increase pod sets and beans.
5. Finding the key to allow soybeans to use direct fertilizer application to the soil.

Now we have the production problem settled. With tongue in cheek, I will tell you how we propose to dispose of the products. I am going to speak in general terms and since I am out on the limb so far anyway, I am reluctant to venture much farther.

On my recent trip overseas, I came home convinced that the world offers a tremendous market for our oilseed products. With the rapid increase in population along with the already pitifully low consumption in many areas, it seems to me that we simply must take advantage of this opportunity.

What is needed? We need to work diligently to expand the demand. The consumers are there waiting—we must cultivate the taste for new oilseed products. When people are exposed to them, they will come back for more. To sell, you must knock on doors. I personally believe we have the prospect for some sore knuckles ahead of us.

We need to service the market after the products are in the buyers' hands. They have to know how to use them and how to get the best results from all U.S. commodities. This means manpower is needed to follow up the first contacts to consummate a lasting business relationship. If the products are available to the market, then it's up to the U.S. industry to follow.

All of this takes money. We are using Public Law 480 funds, but we must match these funds with up to 50 percent of our own dollars or contributions by foreign cooperators. The food-for-peace program has been in existence for slightly over 10 years. I expect it to continue for some time at least. Nevertheless, we should be looking to the future and thinking of the day when we will take over the program without Government assistance. I place this before you for your future thinking.

Before I conclude, let me call your attention to some of the products that we believe could well be the important new products to take their place in the problem of feeding the human population of the world.

Remember, the world desperately needs fats and oils and proteins. These important nutritional needs have been documented by many world organizations.

The calorie needs can be met by additional supplies of fats and oils. Soybeans will take a leading role in filling the gap—but, how about protein? The shortage of this essential dietary component has long been recognized.

Meat has long been a great supplier of this need, but in some nations of the world meat is not consumed because of religious restrictions. Soybean protein can fill this gap.

What are some of these products? Let's name a few: soy beverage, soy grits, soy flour, whole soybeans as food and soy protein as meat replacer are a few.

The U.S. Government, at the present time, is preparing specifications to ask for offers on 7,500 tons of soybean beverage and soybean grits. These products are to be tested among schoolchildren for their acceptability in about half a dozen countries.

Acceptance of these products could literally open up a Pandora's box of demand. The soybean could then be truly called upon to feed the world.

The Soybean Council is working closely with the Government to assist them in drawing up the specifications and arrangements necessary to acquire the products for testing.

Yes, we have a lot of history left to write, and the lowly immigrant from China will probably be asked to help do the job.

In the meantime, we hope to continue to be effective and to do the job you expect of us. We need your support and your help. I thank you for your kind support in the past.

DEATH OF DR. VIRGIL HANCHER, FORMER PRESIDENT OF UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, when Dr. Virgil Hancher died on January 30, Iowa and the Nation lost a great educator.

As president of the State University of Iowa for nearly a quarter century, Dr. Hancher was a leader in shaping education in the Nation. During his tenure, SUI doubled its student enrollment and tripled its original size.

As the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette, stated it:

He never let down in his efforts to interpret those needs to the public, and particularly to the legislature, in ways that would

result in greater financial support for the institution.

Mr. President, I was privileged to be a member of the Iowa Legislature during some of the years when Dr. Hancher used to interpret these needs to the legislature. I can vouch for the effectiveness with which he did so.

The United States lost a forceful spokesman when he died in India while serving with the Ford Foundation only a few months after his retirement as president of the State University of Iowa.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "A Friend's Tribute," published in the Fort Dodge Messenger, and an editorial entitled "So Little Time," published in the Cedar Rapids Gazette, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Fort Dodge (Iowa) Messenger, Feb. 5, 1965]

A FRIEND'S TRIBUTE

Dr. Virgil Hancher, who headed the University of Iowa for 23 years until his retirement last June, was a man who deserved the numerous eloquent tributes which have been paid to him since his death in India last Saturday.

His career during a time when the university grew 3½ times its original size and student enrollment doubled has been amply publicized. The Rolfe-born and raised lawyer-educator is held in especially high esteem in this area—he was truly one of northwest Iowa's most famous and best loved sons.

No one we know could better sum up the human side of Dr. Hancher than W. Earl Hall, longtime editor of the Mason City Globe-Gazette who as a member of the board of regents was instrumental in bringing him back to Iowa to head the university. Mr. Hall, who retired from the Mason City editorship 2 years ago, was a close friend of Dr. Hancher from the time they met as freshmen on the Iowa campus in 1914. Here is the moving tribute Mr. Hall had paid to his departed friend:

"I never knew anybody more considerate of those about him, or more sympathetic with them in their problems.

"I never knew anybody with a greater affection in life, or a greater veneration in death, than he had for his wonderful parents. This quality was manifest in him as husband and father.

"I never knew anybody as articulate in conversation or public address. His comprehension of our language gave him a word for the finest shades of meaning. I heard him speak publicly countless times and I never once heard him make a poor speech.

"But just as important * * * maybe more so * * * he was a wonderful listener.

"I never knew anybody with as complete a stock of appropriate stories.

"I never knew a layman with as profound an understanding of the Bible.

"I have seen him in his moments of righteous indignation, but I never saw him lose control of his temper.

"Even in our student days, I had Virgil Hancher pegged for greatness. So did everybody else who knew him. I thought in terms of statesmanship, governor, then senator, perhaps.

"It didn't turn out that way. And I am persuaded that from the standpoint of total contribution to his day and age, the path he took was the right one.

"His was a life of supreme usefulness.

"Virgil Hanchers don't come along very often. There will never be another one so far as I am concerned."

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, Feb. 3, 1965]

SO LITTLE TIME

Most poignant element in the sorrow and shock thousands of Iowans felt on hearing of the sudden death of Dr. Virgil M. Hancher doubtless was regret that he and his good wife had only a few months to enjoy a well-deserved respite from the long strain of administering of a large and growing State university.

Much of Dr. Hancher's quarter-century tenure of the presidency of the University of Iowa was a constant and discouraging struggle to meet steadily mounting needs with inadequate resources. He never let down in his efforts to interpret those needs to the public, and particularly to the legislature, in ways that would result in greater financial support for the institution. But he well knew that it was a struggle which would have no ending, and its recurring skirmishes often brought him disappointment bordering on despair.

After 24 years of that, even though he could look back on an outstanding record of accomplishment, it is quite understandable that he looked forward to lessened pressure and fresh experiences in the new undertaking that followed his retirement from the university post. It is a pity that he had so little time to savor them. One consoling thought is that the occasion of Dr. Hancher's retirement inspired his many friends to say while he could still hear them the things they will continue to say about him for many years in the future.

REAPPORTIONMENT: SHALL THE COURT OR THE PEOPLE DECIDE?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, an article entitled "Reapportionment: Shall the Court or the People Decide?" written by Holman Harvey and Kenneth O. Gilmore, was published in the March 1965 Reader's Digest. Because of its timeliness in connection with the hearings that are now in progress before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning the proposed constitutional amendment, of which I happen to be a cosponsor, I believe the article will be of terest to readers of the RECORD; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REAPPORTIONMENT: SHALL THE COURT OR THE PEOPLE DECIDE?

(By Holman Harvey and Kenneth O. Gilmore)

It is more than a power struggle between city dwellers and country dwellers. At issue in today's political battles over the makeup of State legislatures are fundamental principles of democratic representation.

Lightning struck last June 15 when the Supreme Court handed down its "one man, one vote" reapportionment decision. This decree requires both branches of every State legislature to be strictly based on population only. It represents the most far-reaching change in American political structure since our Constitution was written 178 years ago.

Few issues in recent times have stirred more controversy or created more confusion. Nearly every State in the Nation—from Montana to Maryland, from Alaska to Florida—is struggling to satisfy the Federal judiciary's order. A dozen States have already remapped their legislative districts. Others are desperately trying to meet Court-imposed deadlines or to devise delaying tactics. In the meantime, proposals for a constitutional amendment reversing the Court's action are being seriously debated in Congress and in the States.

Make no mistake, we are at a crossroads: our form of government is in a major crisis. What then are the stakes?

REPRESENT THE PEOPLE

"The basic issue," says Robert G. Dixon, Jr., professor of law at George Washington University, "is not simply 'one-man, one-vote.' It is fair representation, a concept which philosophers and politicians have been arguing about for ages."

Since the beginnings of democracy in the Greek city-states, man has groped for the best ways to govern himself and to achieve a true representation of the people's will. As far back as the 11th century England began to move painfully toward more representative government; kings formed various councils consisting of lords, clerics, and powerful landowners. Later, townships, boroughs and counties were called into councils—originally to be consulted on property taxes.

In America at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787, this was the essential question: How could a balanced genuinely representative form of government be achieved, one that would reflect the majority will while protecting the minority and preventing mob rule? A solution was hammered out by our forefathers. So that the large States could not be controlled by the small or the small steamrollered by the large, a two-house plan was born, with a House of Representatives based on population and a Senate based on geography.

Thomas Jefferson is reputed to have asked George Washington why he favored the system. Washington asked Jefferson why he poured his coffee from cup to saucer. "To cool it" was the response.

"Even so," Washington said, "we pour legislation into the senatorial saucer to cool it."

As America matured into the world's first successful example of modern constitutional democracy, States adopted the Federal two-house system. By 1961, all but 11 States had constitutions that took into account interests other than population—geographic factors, mainly—so as to achieve fair representation. Missouri's "Little Federal" system furnishes an example. One house is apportioned on the basis of districts of fairly equal population in both city and rural areas, with districts adjusted every 10 years. In the other chamber each of the 114 counties has at least 1 member. Under these provisions, cooperation between city and rural areas is a valued tradition.

THE CHICKEN VOTE

But—and this is where the rub came—as America's cities grew, some States neglected to reapportion their lower houses. The result was, in many States, unjust rural domination of legislatures. Delaware's house districts had not changed since 1897. So unbalanced was Connecticut's house of representatives that one vote in a rural town was worth 429 votes in Hartford. In New Hampshire's lower house, one district had 1,000 times more residents than another.

One remiss State was Tennessee, with no revisions since 1901. A group went to court to force reapportionment of the assembly, with Memphis resident Charles W. Baker suing the secretary of state, Joe C. Carr. "The pigs and chickens in our smaller counties have better representation in the Tennessee Legislature than the people of Nashville," declared that city's mayor.

The case reached the Supreme Court. Contrary to all previous decisions—and to Justice Felix Frankfurter's warning that the judiciary "ought not to enter this political thicket"—the Court ruled in 1962 that State legislative districts are subject to its judicial scrutiny.

The *Baker* v. *Carr* decision was a bombshell. It spawned similar reapportionment suits in 34 States. So varied were the court interpretations that cases from six states—Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia—were appealed to the High Tribunal.

Then on June 15, 1964, the nine black-robed men filed into the marbled chambers and handed down their shattering decision. In four cases the voting was eight to one; in the other two, six to three. In all cases, the long-established "Little Federal" system was knocked out. Chief Justice Earl Warren justified the decision on the provision of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution which requires that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." He wrote: "Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests."

QUESTION THE WISDOM

There were vigorous dissents to the decision, Justice Potter Stewart noted: "The Court's draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, or in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union."

"It is difficult to imagine a more intolerable and inappropriate interference by the judiciary with the independent legislatures of the States," said Justice John M. Harlan. "Peoples are not ciphers, legislators can represent their electors only by speaking for their interests—economic, social, political—many of which do reflect where the electors live."

Aroused critics from both political parties questioned the wisdom of the Court's fiat. The Wall Street Journal summed up the feelings of many when it said, "The Court had a chance to bolster our traditions by requiring one house truly on population, and permitting the other on a geographical or other basis to reflect common interests. Instead of stopping with that, its fiat threw out institutions painfully wrought by experience and tried to substitute abstract theory."

The House of Representatives was so incensed that it rammed through a bill stripping all Federal courts of the power to hear or review State legislative apportionment cases. The Senate passed a "sense of Congress" with the purpose of asking the courts to go slow in forcing State legislatures to fall into line until the whole matter could be reviewed.

PROBLEMS THAT COUNT

Today, as this momentous issue is debated across the land, every citizen should ponder these points:

(1) The Court's decree threatens to spark a chain reaction that may go all the way down to the school board level. There are 3,072 counties in the United States, and 91,185 local governments. How long will it be before the Federal courts poke into each of these units of representative democracy to take head counts and draw boundary lines? A Michigan court recently told Kent County's board of supervisors that it must be reapportioned on a population-only basis. Other suits have been filed in New York and California. Where, exactly, will it end?

"Carry the Court's decision to its logical conclusion," says William S. White, Pulitzer Prize-winning biographer and journalist, "and even the historic and deliberate population imbalance in the U.S. Senate could not in any logic longer prevail." After all, Nevada's 285,000 citizens elect as many U.S. Senators as do New York's 17 million.

(2) The decision will swing the pendulum from legislatures with outdated apportionment and too much rural weight, to legislatures under the raw control of metropolitan vote-getting machines. In 25 States, more than half the population resides in metropolitan areas. In 14 States, three populous counties or fewer will elect more than 50 percent of the legislators.[1] America's sprawling urban areas will call the shots, up and down the land. Chicago will hold sway over Illinois, Detroit over Michigan, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh over Pennsylvania, Phoenix over Arizona, and Las Vegas over Nevada.

The specter of raids on State treasuries by metropolitan-dominated legislatures concerns many. They see pressures mounting for more State funds for urban renewal, relief cases and public housing—with many of the funds being matched by U.S. tax dollars. These spending programs in turn will garner more votes for the city machines. Mayors in some States may soon be far more influential than the Governor.

New York is perhaps the most vivid case. Here 38 percent of the population has been able to elect a majority in the senate, thus protecting certain underpopulated counties of this large State with all its diverse interest. But, under the Court's rule, it is only a matter of time before the New York City metropolitan area, with 63 percent of the State's population, will be completely dominant.

(3) Some groups of voters can be wiped out, under a "winner-take-all" numerical system. The Court's decision, notes the Christian Science Monitor, "will tend to weaken the complex American system for diffusing power and protecting minorities." For example, under a purely numerical system of redistricting, South Dakota's 30,000 Indians, who live in huge reservations covering entire counties, will lose two State senators who now watch out for their interests.

Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, says: "People have ever-changing problems that sometimes fail to yield to computer logic. Some may be lumbermen, miners, fishermen, or farmers. Some may be of one religion or national origin peculiar in need or consideration. Some may direct their needs toward secondary roads or superhighways, while others are more concerned about the rapid-transit system. Certainly the majority must have effective rule, but the minority, too, is entitled to effective representation, lest important segments of our people be completely subject to the tyranny of a temporary majority."

Chief Justice Warren himself declared, in 1948, when he was Governor of California: "Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the (State) senate to a strictly population basis."

(4) The Court's decree is a dangerous intrusion by the Federal judiciary into the political affairs of the States. Hardly was the "one-man one-vote" decision announced before lower courts showed how fast and how far they were willing to muscle in on the deliberations of State governments. Just 2 days after the June 15 decision, a U.S. district court directed the Michigan Apportionment Commission to come up with a districting plan in 48 hours. In a Vermont case appealed to the Supreme Court, it was ruled in January that the legislature must decide upon a plan and then disband—even though this defies the State constitution.

In Oklahoma a three-man Federal district court ignored the machinery set up by the State for reapportionment and autocratically undertook to rearrange the State's legislative districts itself. It set up a master plan that was a nightmare of free-floating voting zones and mistakes. Angrily, Oklahoma's Senator MIKE MONRONEY said: "Hasty and ill-advised redistricting formulas promulgated by the courts can result in confusion and inequities. Good local self-government cannot be imposed from above. It must be generated by the people themselves."

(5) The Court's edict means that the citizens of a State can no longer decide upon their own form of representative government. One of the six States involved in the Court's June 15 ruling was Colorado. Few States have so diligently attempted to work out a method of representation tailored to their own unique characteristics. Since it became a State in 1876, its legislature has been reapportioned five times. In the spring of 1962, citizens' groups gathered to work out a reapportionment amendment that would keep pace with the State's increasing urban growth. They split into two camps. One wanted both houses of the general assembly based on population alone; the other supported a "Federal plan," keeping geographic representation in the senate.

Each side took its case to the public. They fought up and down the State with countless speeches, debates, newspaper ads, billboard posters, radio and TV spots. This referendum overshadowed all other election issues in Colorado that year. And the outcome was stunningly clear. The Federal plan won by 305,700 to 172,725. It carried every county in the State.

The amendment was challenged; it was upheld by a Federal district court. And then, on June 15, the Supreme Court threw out Colorado's plan. In an amazing statement, Chief Justice Warren said that, because the plan adopted was contrary to the Court's new ruling, Colorado's referendum vote was "without Federal constitutional significance."

There were stinging dissents. Said Justice Tom C. Clark: "Colorado, by an overwhelming vote, has written the organization of its legislative body into its constitution. In striking down Colorado's plan of apportionment, the Court is invading the valid functioning of the procedures of the States, and thereby commits a grievous error which will do irreparable damage to our Federal-State relationship."

Today Colorado's senate has been redrawn to satisfy the Court. But the issue is still being debated. Meanwhile, the voters wonder what, if anything, their ballot is worth, or their State constitution.

WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Only one recourse is left to American citizens who wish to restore our representative system to its original integrity: an amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Today in Congress, and in the States, forces are gathering behind proposals that would:

1. Guarantee the citizens of every State the right to decide for themselves, by one-man one-vote ballot, the apportionment of their own legislature.

2. Guarantee that this power will not be curtailed or reviewed by any Federal court.

3. Guarantee that one house of each legislature can reflect factors other than population if such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people.

This in essence would be the 25th amendment to the Constitution. Whether it is passed in Congress and ratified by the States will depend upon the support it receives from the American people. The stakes are

[1] Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington.

high—as high as the preservation of our Republic.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 352) providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, March 15, 1965, at 9 o'clock post meridian, to receive the President of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the wish of the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate concur in the desire of the House to welcome the President in joint session.

PROTECTION OF RIGHT OF INDIVIDUALS TO REGISTER AND VOTE

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and a bipartisan group of Senators, namely, Senators CASE, CLARK, COOPER, FONG, HART, JAVITS, MCNAMARA, PROXMIRE, and SCOTT, I introduce a bill to protect the rights of individuals to register and to vote in State and Federal elections without discrimination because of race or color.

A bipartisan group of Senators, in keeping with our long established practice developed over a period of years, has been working together this winter for many weeks to develop a more effective voting rights bill, and detailed drafts have been prepared and subjected to criticism and review.

The deplorable events at Selma and elsewhere have shocked us all and intensified our desire to develop and aid in the passage of an adequate bill.

INTENTION TO INTRODUCE BILL ANNOUNCED

Last Thursday a group of 10 Senators—virtually identical with those who are now sponsoring this bill—announced that they intended to introduce such a bill today, Monday, March 15, and that it should be a bill, and not a proposed constitutional amendment; that it should apply to State and local elections as well as national elections; that it should outlaw literacy and other tests designed to deny the right to vote; that it should provide for appointment of Federal voting registrars by the President, who would be brought into existence almost automatically by certain objective and standard requirements.

It is in keeping with this promise which we made to the country and to our constituents that the present group is now introducing this bill, which I ask unanimous consent may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1517) to protect the right of individuals to register and to vote in State and Federal elections without discrimination because of race or color, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

APPLIES TO STATE AND LOCAL ELECTIONS AS WELL TO FEDERAL ELECTIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there are several features of the bill which I think should be noted.

First. It applies to Federal, State, and local elections. It is necessary to have a bill apply to State and local elections if the right to vote is to be made meaningful. We believe that there is abundant constitutional justification for the application of a bill to State and local elections under the first and second sections of the 15th amendment to the Constitution, and also under certain provisions of the 14th amendment to the Constitution, primarily the equal protection of the laws clause.

OUTLAWS LITERACY TESTS

Second. The bill outlaws all literacy tests in those areas of the country where there has been discrimination against Negroes. Specifically, it outlaws literacy tests in Mississippi, Alabama, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, and Louisiana.

OUTLAWS OTHER TESTS

Third. The bill also outlaws other methods of discrimination in those areas, such as tests of moral character and requirements that there should be other persons who would vouch for applicants for registration. It sweeps away the discriminatory provisions which have been passed in many Southern States since the epoch-making civil rights decision of the Supreme Court in May of 1954.

AUTOMATIC APPOINTMENT OF REGISTRARS

Fourth. The bill provides for Federal registrars wherever there is discrimination in registration and/or voting, and it makes the appointment of registrars practically automatic.

Thus, wherever less than 25 percent of the total number of Negroes of voting age residing in any county were not registered to vote in the national election of 1964, the President must appoint Federal registrars within 90 days of the enactment of the bill.

He must also appoint them whenever less than 50 percent of the total number of persons of voting age voted in the November 1964 election if 20 persons file a written petition alleging denial of their efforts to register.

Fifth. These Federal registrars are to be selected from existing governmental officials who occupy the status of grade 12 or above in the civil or postal service, and they can be drawn from the country as a whole, and need not be drawn from any given judicial district, State, or local political subdivision.

SIMPLE QUALIFICATIONS

Sixth. The Federal registrars will register everyone who meets State qualifications of age, residence, citizenship, mental competency, and absence of the conviction of a felony. These qualifications are frozen as of May 17, 1964.

POWER TO CAST VOTE AND HAVE IT COUNTED

Seven. The bill provides that anyone who is registered by a Federal registrar must be accorded the right to vote in all elections and provides for enforcement of this right, including the staying of the certification of results of any election in which persons federally registered have been denied the right to vote.

STATE POLL TAXES OUTLAWED

Eighth. The bill outlaws poll taxes in all State and local elections.

WELCOME PRESIDENT'S BILL

Mr. President, perhaps I should say a word about the relationship of this bill to the welcomed message of the President tonight and to the bill which it is reported the Department of Justice is drafting.

The present bill, as I have said, has been under discussion and detailed drafting now for many weeks.

We have had a productive interchange of views between ourselves and the members of the Justice Department, especially during the last week. We wish to commend the President for the splendid way in which he has taken up the challenge of Selma, for his excellent statement to the country on Saturday, and for what we believe will be an epoch-making Presidential address tonight.

COOPERATIVE EFFORT

The bill is in no sense a rival to the bill which will be introduced on behalf of the Justice Department in a few days. As I have stated, it has been a cooperative relationship between the drafters of our bill, the Senators sponsoring it, and the Department of Justice. We may well have learned certain things from them. It is possible that they may have learned certain things from us. This is a highly important subject. There are many issues involved. We believe that the general good is served if we have alternative drafts before the Senate and before the country. We believe that these alternative drafts will result in a healthy dialog over the issues. I do not believe that there will be any division over the purposes. We seek the most effective measure that we can get. For the benefit of the public this bill is merely our expression of what we believe a voting bill should be like, and we ask that it be studied and scrutinized.

In conclusion, let me read into the RECORD a telegram which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and I have just received:

The introduction of the bipartisan voting rights bill is a great opportunity to enact a Federal statute which will put an end to the continued denial of the right to vote. We commend you, your colleagues, and the senatorial staff members for the serious, tireless, and effective manner in which you have

sought to cover all valid complaints against racial discrimination in registration and voting. We appreciate the numerous and extensive conferences held during the past weeks and months since the 89th Congress began. For our part we have sought to present and discuss the views that we were authorized to state on behalf of our associates in the civil rights struggle for justice and equality under law. As always, we have found attentive ears and cooperative hearts among those who today sponsor this bill.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Sr.,
General Counsel, UAW,
Vice Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action.

CLARENCE MITCHELL,
Director, Washington Bureau, NAACP.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The following States have literacy laws that would be effected by this act: Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.

The following States in the 1964 presidential election had fewer than 50 percent of those of voting age actually voting in the election:

	Percent
Alaska	48.7
Louisiana	47.3
Texas	44.0
Arkansas	49.8
Virginia	41.0
Alabama	36.0
South Carolina	38.0
Georgia	43.2
Mississippi	32.9

The following States in 1964 are estimated to have had less than 50 percent of the Negro population of voting age registered in 1964:

	Percent
Alabama	23.0
Arkansas	49.3
Georgia	44.0
Louisiana	32.0
Mississippi	6.7
North Carolina	46.8
South Carolina	38.8
Virginia	45.7

EXHIBIT 1

S. 1517

A bill to protect the right of individuals to register and to vote in State and Federal elections without discrimination because of race or color

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that the denial or infringement of the right to vote because of race or color is a violation of the fourteenth and fifteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States and of the legislation adopted by the Congress to enforce those amendments, including the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Civil Rights Act of 1960, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Congress finds that, despite those enactments, the right to vote continues to be denied to many citizens of the United States on grounds of their race or color, and that the methods prescribed in this Act are the only available means of assuring all citizens their right to vote.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "election" means any general, special, or primary election held in any State or political subdivision thereof solely or partially for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate to public office; and any election held in any State or political subdivision thereof solely or partially to decide a proposition or issue of public law.

(b) The term "voting district" means any county, parish, or similar political subdivision of a State, or any political subdivision of a State which is independent of the political jurisdiction of a county, parish, or similar political subdivision. If there are no counties, parishes, or similar political subdivisions of a State, such State shall, for the purposes of this Act, constitute a single voting district.

(c) The term "test" includes (i) any test of, or condition of registration or voting requiring, the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter; (ii) any test of moral character; (iii) any requirement that other persons vouch for or act as witness for applicants for registration.

(d) The term "mental competency" means absence of an adjudication of mental incompetency.

TITLE I—LITERACY AND OTHER TESTS

SEC. 101. (a) Congress hereby finds that—

(i) The unconstitutional segregation of educational and other facilities on grounds of race or color in various States has resulted in inequalities of educational attainment and opportunity which render tests in such States discriminatory on grounds of race or color;

(ii) tests have been utilized in various States as an instrument of discrimination on grounds of race or color through the use of arbitrary standards, unfair decisions, and similar devices; and

(iii) tests have been required of persons of one race or color as a condition of registration and voting in various States at the same time that such tests have not been required of another race or color.

(b) Congress further finds that in any State employing a test—

(i) where the number of persons of any race or color of voting age residing in such State who were registered to vote at the time of the November 1964 election was less than 50 per centum of the number of all persons of such race or color of voting age then residing in such State; or

(ii) where less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing in such State voted in the November 1964 election,

such test has been and is being utilized as an instrument of discrimination in violation of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution.

SEC. 102. Within sixty days of the enactment of this Act, the President shall certify and cause to be published in the Federal Register a list of those States to which either numerical finding in section 101(b) applies.

SEC. 103. In any State listed in accordance with section 102, the application of any test to a person seeking to register or vote in a Federal, State or local election, is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 104. The provisions of section 103 shall remain in effect in any State unless and until the President shall certify that discrimination in registration and voting in that State has terminated and that there is no substantial risk of any renewed discrimination.

SEC. 105. The provisions of this title shall be enforceable:

(a) By appropriate civil actions instituted in the district courts of the United States by the Attorney General, for or in the name of the United States; and

(b) By the appointment of a Federal registrar or registrars in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 106. The contempt provisions of section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and the three-judge court provisions of section 101(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall be applicable to proceedings brought under section 105(a).

TITLE II—FEDERAL REGISTRARS

Appointment of Federal registrars

SEC. 201. (a) The President shall, within ninety days after the enactment of this Act, establish an office of Federal registrar for any voting district, if the President determines that the total number of persons of any race or color who were registered to vote in the November 1964 election in such voting district for the purpose of electing any candidate for the office of President is less than 25 per centum of the total number of all persons of such race or color of voting age residing in such voting district.

(b) In addition, the President shall establish an office of Federal registrar for any voting district at any time thereafter that the total number of persons of any race or color who are registered to vote in any succeeding general election is less than 25 per centum of the total number of all persons of such race or color of voting age residing in such voting district.

(c) Whenever twenty or more persons residing in a voting district file a written petition with the President alleging denial of their right to register to vote in any election in such voting district on account of their race or color, the President shall establish an office of Federal registrar in such voting district if he has reason to believe such allegations are true, and—

(i) the voting district is one in which less than 50 per centum of the total number of all persons of voting age residing therein voted in the November 1964 election, or

(ii) the voting district is in a State where less than 50 per centum of the total number of all persons of voting age residing in the entire State voted in the November 1964, election.

(d) Upon the establishment of an office of Federal registrar in any voting district, the President shall appoint a sufficient number of Federal registrars for such voting district to achieve the purpose of this title from among officers or employees of the United States who receive basic compensation at a rate of basic salary which is equivalent to at least grade 12 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949. Each individual, so appointed as a Federal registrar, shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for his regular office or employment, but while engaged in the performance of the duties of a registrar shall be allowed travel and subsistence expenses while away from his home or regular post of duty in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

(e) Each individual who is appointed a Federal registrar for a voting district shall perform the duties required by this Act, as may be designated by the President, until such time as he is relieved of such duties by the President, or until the office of Federal registrar for such voting district is terminated by the President as provided in subsection (f).

(f) Whenever the President determines that denial of the right to vote has ceased in any voting district for which he has established an office of Federal registrar, he shall terminate the office of Federal registrar for such voting district.

(g) If, after the termination of the office of Federal registrar for a voting district, the President determines in accordance with subsections (b) or (c) that it is necessary and appropriate to reestablish the office for such

voting district in order to enforce the provisions of this Act, he shall do so and appoint one or more Federal registrars for such area as provided in subsection (d).

Registration by Federal registrars

SEC. 202. The Congress hereby finds:

(a) The qualifications and other conditions prescribed by State laws for voting, or registering to vote, in Federal and State elections, other than qualifications based upon age, residence, citizenship, mental competency, and absence of conviction for a felony, are susceptible of use, and have been used, to deny persons the right to vote, because of their race or color; and

(b) The application of qualifications and other conditions by Federal registrars appointed under this title, other than those excepted in subsection (a), would impede and obstruct Federal registrars in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 203. (a) The Federal registrar or registrars for any voting district shall, upon application therefor, register to vote in elections held in such voting district any individual whom the Federal registrar finds to have the requisite qualifications as to citizenship, age, residence, mental competency, and absence of conviction for a felony under the laws of the State in which such voting district is located. An individual so registered by a Federal registrar shall receive a certificate identifying him as a person so qualified to vote in such elections.

(b) If a State imposes or has imposed qualifications with respect to citizenship, age, residence, mental competency, or absence of conviction for a felony more restrictive than those in effect on May 17, 1954, the Federal registrar or registrars in that State shall apply the State law in effect on May 17, 1954.

(c) The Federal registrar or registrars for any voting district shall conform to regulations promulgated by the President with respect to the time, place and manner of the performance of the duties prescribed by this Act.

(d) The Federal registrar or registrars of any voting district shall, from time to time, transmit certifications to the proper State and local officials of the individuals who have been registered by them. Such certifications shall be final and not subject to judicial review except as provided in section 205.

(e) All persons certified for registration by Federal registrars in a voting district shall continue to be entitled to vote in any election held in such voting district during the period of service of a Federal registrar in such district, notwithstanding the requirement of reregistration or any other requirement by the State in which such voting district is located. After the office of Federal registrar for any voting district is terminated, all persons certified for registration by Federal registrars in such voting district shall continue to be entitled to vote in any election held in such voting district, if reregistration is required under the laws of the State in which such voting district is located, until they have a reasonable opportunity to reregister without discrimination on account of their race or color.

Voting in elections

SEC. 204. Each individual who is registered by a Federal registrar pursuant to section 203 shall have the right to vote, and to have such vote counted, in any election held in the voting district where he resides during the effective period of his registration, unless after his registration and prior to any such election the Federal registrar determines that by reason of any of the qualifications specified in section 203(a) of this Act he has become ineligible to vote in such elections.

Enforcement

SEC. 205. (a) Any challenge to the eligibility to vote of persons registered under section 203 of this Act, or any review of the denial of registration by a Federal registrar under section 203 shall be within the sole jurisdiction of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the voting district is located. Each person registered under this Act shall be permitted to cast his vote and have it counted pending the determination by the reviewing court of the validity of such challenge or challenges. Any challenge to the eligibility of a person to register under this Act shall be made within five days following such registration, except that challenge shall be in order in any case of fraud or ineligibility arising after registration.

(b) The provisions of this Act shall be enforceable by appropriate civil actions instituted in the district courts of the United States by the Attorney General, for or in the name of the United States. When necessary to assure persons registered under this Act of the right to vote and to have their votes counted, the district court concerned shall issue permanent or temporary injunctions or other orders directed to appropriate State or local voting officials, requiring them to permit persons so registered to cast their votes and have them counted and staying the certification of the results of such election pending the determination by the court in the case involved.

(c) The provisions of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971) shall be applicable with respect to all cases of criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act.

(d) The provisions of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971) shall be applicable with respect to all threats of intimidation or coercion of persons seeking to register and vote under the provisions of this Act.

Continued effect pending judicial review

SEC. 206. In any case in which a challenge is made to the constitutionality of this Act, the appropriate reviewing court shall issue an order authorizing the provisions of this Act and the authority granted therefrom to continue in effect pending determination of the validity of such challenge..

TITLE III—PROHIBITION OF POLL TAXES

SEC. 301. The Congress hereby finds:

(a) That the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting has historically been one of the methods used to circumvent the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, and that the passage of laws establishing such a requirement in the States still retaining this requirement was for the purpose, in whole or in part, of denying persons the right to vote because of race or color, and that this requirement has been and is being applied discriminatorily so as to deprive persons of the right to vote because of race or color;

(b) That the requirement of the payment of poll tax as a condition upon a prerequisite to voting is not a bona fide qualification of an elector, but an arbitrary and unreasonable restriction upon the right to vote in violation of the 14th and 15th amendments.

SEC. 302. No State shall require the payment of a poll tax as a condition upon or a prerequisite to voting in any election conducted under its authority.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes

SEC. 402. Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971), is amended as follows:

(a) In subsections (a)(2) and (c), strike out "Federal", immediately preceding "election", wherever it appears in such subsections.

(b) Strike out subsection (f) thereof.

Exercise of functions conferred upon President

SEC. 403. (a) The President may delegate authority to exercise any of the functions conferred upon him by this Act to such officer of the United States Government as he shall direct.

(b) In making numerical determinations required under this Act, the President may make such determinations on the best statistical information available to him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] will deal with this subject as will I. The bipartisan cooperation we have met with is typified by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and other Senators; namely, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who have joined with an equal number of Republican Senators in cosponsoring the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. This bipartisanship has been a source of great inspiration to me, and of great sustenance and support in the civil rights struggle.

This must be clearly understood: the introduction of this bill is in no sense a race or rivalry with the President's message, to be delivered tonight, in what we hope will result in an even better bill than ours. All that we are trying to do is to erect a standard both in terms and in time, and to utilize that standard for the purpose of advancing the enactment, at the earliest possible moment, of a voting rights bill, which has been shown to be so critically necessary.

The real spark in this matter is the danger to the country now. We see that justice has been too long deferred in the voting rights field. Let us not forget what happened in 1957, 1960, and 1964, when men like the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators, including myself, wore our hearts out trying to get the terms which are now being incorporated into the bill, or at least terms like them. We saw coming exactly what has occurred. Of all the problems which we could not defer, the denial of voting rights is the most important.

I emphasize, therefore, that this bill sets an optimum standard both as to timing and as to terms. Representing the great State of New York, nothing would please me better than to see the administration racing far ahead of us both in terms and in time, and to have one steady march of progress along the track, in the hands of those who are dedicated to seeing to it that Negroes get the right to vote—to put it bluntly and simply.

Selma has aroused the country to the reality of the situation, that elementary justice calls for action on the part of Congress.

We do not know what the administration bill provides for. We have not seen it. We have seen many reports of what it will contain. We have been acquainted with some drafts. From what we know about it, I believe that our bill contains

certain principal provisions which should be followed. One of those provisions would be the elimination of the poll tax in State and local elections, which we believe to be important. Another of the provisions would be the appointment of registrars from among Federal officials who need not be residents of the voting district in order to serve there. Another provision would trigger the appointment of registrars where there are an unusually small number of Negroes registered, according to the best figures available to the President. Finally, the President should appoint the registrars, which would give them the greatest prestige and authority.

We believe that this problem is one on which the country should be able to get together, including our southern friends, who have themselves often stated that the right to vote is one right they do not challenge, even considering the so-called social order of the South. I believe that doing something meaningful and tangible in this area is now very much in order.

Incidentally, although Selma is being epitomized and dramatized widely, a great many people have approached me, Negro and white alike, telling me it is almost a shame, that in the concern for Selma, it has not been noticed that in community after community in this same area of the country, bodies have been crushed, lives have been extinguished, people have been intimidated just as forcefully and in greater numbers than in Selma, but they have not been widely publicized.

With that kind of tragic situation, anything that can be done to get action is desirable. With the greatest respect for the President and with the greatest desire to uphold his hand in doing what is right, I feel deeply that this will be the time to push for the terms and the timing and to get done what must be done for the country.

I hope very much that the bill which I have introduced, S. 1497, with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], dealing with excessive police action, may similarly have the prompt consideration of Congress. The need for this measure has also been markedly emphasized by the events in Selma.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I commend the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for his able, courageous, and cooperative work in the field of civil rights.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

I wish all Senators to know how deeply gratifying it is to be associated with them in this great effort. As has already been stated, we are not rivals of the executive branch of the Government, the President, or the Department of Justice. Our action represents the evidence of our deep conviction of urgency in this matter.

It would be most inappropriate for Congress, it seems to me, not to take the initiative. Congress is supposed to legislate and develop policy and enact bills into law. It would be doing less than its duty, especially in the view of those of us who have a deep conviction on this subject, if we sat back and waited for some proposals to be presented by the executive branch of the Government, with the approval of the President and with the authorship of the Department of Justice.

We welcome these proposals, and we shall work in partnership with the executive branch, as we have endeavored in the past, in this bipartisan group, who have been concerned with this matter for the past many months, when we have urged and begged that the legislation be forthcoming. We have withheld our own initiative in the introduction of legislation so that we could have full unanimity as between those of us in Congress and the people in the legislative branch.

We are happy indeed that reports have indicated that it is proposed to introduce a bill that will have the full support of the President. I hope that the majority leader and the minority leader in the Senate and also the majority and minority leaders in the House will give it overwhelming support in both Houses of Congress.

However, we have too long delayed. As the Senator from New York has suggested, what we propose should have been a part of the legislation that was enacted in 1957, 1960, and 1964, that great monument, because, as both the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois have indicated, the voting right is something that no one on the floor of the Senate or in the country will say in public is something that ought to be denied to a person on the ground of his color, race, creed, or national origin.

Therefore, we are not in disagreement on the right; only on the question of whether it should actually be granted, or merely be given lip service but actually denied.

The urgency of this matter is such that Congress should, and I hope it will, give its undivided, constant, and continuous attention to it until a bill is passed in the Senate and in the House and signed by the President. That would be doing a great deal for the morale of the country and for those who have suffered under the indignities and injustices of the deprivation of the franchise. If necessary, we should remain here nights and holidays and weekends until this job is done. I pledge for myself continuing support for every effort, in cooperation with my colleagues in the Senate and with the executive branch of the Government to bring this about.

The only thing that will make me at all unhappy or unwilling to cooperate will be an attempt, if it is made, to offer only lip service and not actual legislative accomplishment, or dragging of the feet. I do not look for it, but we shall be ready to meet it if it comes.

The Senator from New York is eminently correct when he says that Selma means, in addition to the basic deprivation of voting rights, brutality by the citizenry and by the governmental officials through their police deputies against people protesting the deprivation of their constitutional rights.

We should do something about this, and that speedily.

I am very hopeful that as a part of this proposed legislation, we may at the same time enact legislation designed to place the responsibility for police brutality, for absence of police protection against private brutality, upon the communities whose agents are guilty of withholding protection and thus inflicting brutal treatment.

For the sake of the country as a whole, for the sake of the country's reputation abroad, for the sake of the individuals who have been mistreated and maimed and killed, and for the sake of their families, we can do no less.

As I said earlier, the right to vote, all agree, is the most basic right of citizenship.

It is equally undeniable that large numbers of citizens are being deprived of that right simply because of the color of their skin.

Through the years, with an ingenuity that would do credit to a worthier cause, there have been fashioned in some States a variety of devices and tests, masking as qualifications for registration and voting, which have effectively blocked the efforts of Negro citizens to exercise the right of the franchise. Indeed, those who oppose those efforts have in many cases resorted to unlawful measures to evade their constitutional responsibilities. Threats, intimidation, coercion, terrorism, and economic reprisal have in many places become commonplace as the protest of the disenfranchised has swelled.

Three times in recent years Congress has acted to protect voting rights. But these measures have not been equal to the task. Frustration and bitterness have grown as attempts at suppression have sunk to new and ugly depths.

As the President has indicated, the situation is urgent. I strongly support his determination that every eligible citizen, be he white or Negro, whatever his race or religion, wherever he may reside, be given effective protection for his right to vote.

The bill in which I and my colleagues join is not a hasty measure.

The bill is the fruit of many weeks of consideration and exchange of views not only among ourselves but with officials of the executive branch. We introduce it in the hope to help Congress fashion an effective instrument to wipe out the shame of discrimination in the voting field.

Salient features of the bill are:

First. The bill applies to Federal, State, and local elections.

Second. The bill outlaws all literacy tests in those areas of the country where there has been discrimination against Negroes. Specifically, it outlaws literacy tests in Mississippi, Alabama, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, and Louisiana.

Third. The bill also outlaws other methods of discrimination in those areas,

such as tests of moral character and requirements that persons vouch for applicants for registration.

Fourth. The bill provides for Federal registrars wherever there is discrimination in registration or voting and it makes the appointment of registrars automatic. Thus, wherever less than 25 percent of the total number of Negroes of voting age residing in any county were registered to vote in the 1964 election, the President must appoint Federal registrars within 90 days of the enactment of this bill. He must also appoint Federal registrars wherever less than 50 percent of the total number of persons of voting age voted in the November 1964 election if 20 persons file a written petition alleging denial of their right to register to vote.

Fifth. The Federal registrar will register everyone who meets the State qualification of age, residence, citizenship, mental competency, and absence of conviction for a felony and these qualifications are frozen as of May 17, 1954.

Sixth. The bill provides that anyone who is registered by a Federal registrar must be accorded the right to vote in all elections and further provides for enforcement of this right, including the staying of the certification of the results of any election in which persons federally registered have been denied the right to vote.

Seventh. The bill outlaws poll taxes in all State and local elections.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. He has always been a highly cooperative and unselfish Member. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator. I know the Senator from Wisconsin has been on his feet trying to obtain the floor. He has been very kind to yield to me, because he knows I have an engagement that I must keep.

The Senator from Illinois, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from New Jersey have spoken of the high hopes of those of us who have introduced the bill. We make no pretense that this is the best or the last word in the effort to develop a legislative response which is adequate to the enormous public pressure all around the country today. We feel that it offers an additional suggestion of those of us in Congress and those in the executive branch of the Government as a means of getting at the problem.

I am grateful to the Senator from Illinois for his leadership over the weeks, as we have sought to find legislative language to meet the situation. I am grateful to the Department of Justice for its exchange of points of view with us. This Congress will be judged very harshly if, with the alarm bell shrieking, we do less than what is required in order that that alarm bell shall never sound again in this country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Michigan. I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished Senator from Illinois and other Senators in support of the bill. First of all, along with the Senator from Illinois, I welcome the decision of the President to take the almost unprecedented step involved in his speech tonight of speaking personally to Congress on one specific domestic issue. It is very rare that any President has done so throughout American history. In speaking to us this evening at 9 o'clock he will be able to speak to as many people in the country as possible, in addition to the Congress. This decision of the President is extremely welcome. It means the President is throwing the immense prestige of his office behind voting legislation in a remarkable way. We have offered this proposed legislation in an effort to support the President in getting the strongest and best possible legislation in this field.

It is very important, as the Senator from Michigan has said, that we enact legislation which is not a matter of bits and pieces. After all, the 1957 Civil Rights Act was a voting rights bill, as was the 1960 bill; so was title I of the 1964 act. And yet, we know we have not done the job. We know that in some sections of the country hundreds of thousands of American citizens, Negroes, are not able to register and are not able to vote. Therefore it is extremely important that we have the strongest and most comprehensive kind of bill enacted into law.

The bill we are offering covers Federal registrars, which many have argued for; it covers State and local elections; it also provides for doing away with the remaining use of literacy tests for discrimination.

As one who had practically no part in the drafting of the bill, I can say that the bill has been most expertly drafted, not only by the Senators involved, but also by the staffs of the Senators and other leading experts in the country, who brought to this bill drafting a lifetime of experience in this subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join in the introduction of the voting rights bill, whose principal sponsors are the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I have joined in the introduction of the voting rights bill with full knowledge that the President will speak to us this evening and that he will immediately propose an effective voting rights bill which he has so urgently discussed and supported. My purpose in joining with others in introducing this bill is to state again my support for an effective voting rights bill, whether it be the administration bill, the one we introduce, or some other.

For 8 years, beginning in 1957, the group of Senators who sponsor this bill, along with others, have introduced numerous bills on civil rights, dealing with subjects including voting rights, school desegregation, public accommodations, and fair employment practices. For example, I have introduced voting rights, school desegregation, and public accommodations bills. These bills were not enacted separately, but they served a useful purpose—and they helped inform and secure the support of the people of of country. They also gave help to the executive branch, and many of the provisions of the bills introduced by this group and others, were incorporated in the bills passed in 1957, 1960, and 1964, sometimes in identical language.

I do not doubt that the bill that will be introduced at the request of the President will contain sections similar to those in the bill we introduce today. It is entirely probable that it may be a stronger and more effective bill. But the bill we introduce today contains ideas which have been developed by study over a period of many days and, indeed, weeks. It could supplement the forthcoming administration bill, and, at minimum, indicate our full support.

Now I would like to turn to another subject which is related to the bill we introduce today. It is the situation in Selma, Ala., and in other areas—situations which illustrate a need for a more effective voting rights law. The States and municipalities have the authority under their police powers—powers to provide for the public safety and order—to enact laws and ordinances regulating demonstrations.

A grave dilemma is thus posed. It is that those who seek their constitutional rights, against States and municipalities, whose officers are violating the Federal Civil Rights Acts and the Constitution itself, do find themselves in violation of State or municipal law. And out of this confrontation, violence has ensued and will continue to ensue unless the true cause is corrected. That cause in the case of Selma is predominantly the violation of the Federal Civil Rights Acts and the Constitution with respect to voting rights. When I spoke on the Birmingham situation 2 years ago, I said that it was hardly intended that the police powers of a State would be used to deny the reasonable expression of speech and petition by citizens seeking their constitutional rights.

The Congress has the authority and the duty to move on its part to enact effective voting rights legislation to remove the substantive cause—which is the denial of the right to vote by States and municipalities.

But the immediate means of removing the danger of violence and brutality lies with the States and municipalities themselves. The Governor of Alabama and the city authorities of that State, as well as those in other States, should permit peaceful demonstrations by those seeking to achieve constitutional rights, as this can be done without obstructing public order and safety. Certainly there is nothing wrong with marching at the side of a highway, and this opportunity could be provided without any obstruction of traffic or order. I believe the demonstrators would and should adhere to such reasonable provision. If the right of peaceful expression is not provided by the States and municipalities, there will be continued violence and brutality, and this is intolerable in our country whose system is based upon the processes of the

law and upon concern for the individual and his rights.

Last week, I joined in the introduction of a bill to provide sanctions against officers and those acting under color of law who use brutality in the exercise of their authority. It should be enacted, but the enactment of these necessary laws, including one for more effective voting rights, will take some time in this session. I hope that the State and municipal authorities will act, and that they will authorize peaceful demonstrations with reasonable provisions for safety and order. If they will not do this, they will create conditions for violence and brutality. They will encourage a disregard for law and order, but above all, they will continue to obstruct and deny the rights of our fellow citizens.

I joined today in the introduction of this bill to indicate again my concern—and the concern of many thousands in my State and throughout the Nation—that the right of every citizen to vote shall be not only guaranteed by the Constitution, but that it shall be made effective by law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield very briefly?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. On the question of timing, which is very important, I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that there be printed in the RECORD the statement of the bipartisan group made last Thursday in which we said we would introduce such a bill today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that statement be printed at this point in the RECORD. Does the Senator from New York have the text of that statement?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. I shall furnish it for the RECORD.

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

MARCH 11, 1965.

A bipartisan group of Senators announced today that on Monday they will introduce a voting rights bill.

The heart of the bill will be a provision for the appointment by the President of Federal voting registrars. The President's power would depend solely upon his factual finding of discrimination measured by specific objective criteria. Thus, the procedure would be automatic and expeditious.

The bill would cover State and local as well as Federal elections.

The Senators are: CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey; JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., of Pennsylvania; JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky; PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois; HIRAM FONG, of Hawaii; PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan; JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York; ROBERT F. KENNEDY, of New York; WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin; and HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, effective legislation to protect the voting rights of all Americans is long overdue.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution provides that "the right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." It directs that "Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Three times during the past 8 years Congress has passed such "appropriate legislation" to enforce "equal protection" for the right to vote. But these enactments have not been effective, because some State and local authorities have unfairly applied voting qualifications and standards of eligibility to many of our Negro citizens.

Mr. President, last year during the civil rights debate I pointed out the many inadequacies of title I of the Civil Rights Act. The bill which a bipartisan group of Senators now proposes effectively provides for these inadequacies. I am happy to join this group of Senators as a cosponsor.

I am aware that the President, deeply concerned about this problem, has announced his intention to speak to a joint session of Congress tonight on the subject of voting rights legislation. I look forward to his address, hopeful that he will propose legislation to the Congress which will secure the right of the franchise, once and for all, to all Americans.

The Congress will have for its consideration a number of voting rights bills. The measure we introduce today, as we promised we would last week, is a product of long and serious consideration. I believe it is a very meritorious measure which I hope Congress will seriously consider before taking final action on badly needed voting rights legislation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last week the world witnessed a shameful display of police brutality which took place in Selma, Ala. The armed posse of a racist sheriff flogged American citizens whose only crime was their desire to vote and their attempt to protest peacefully against those who were preventing them from voting.

The right to vote is fundamental to our way of life. It is a tragedy that we must further guarantee by new legislation that right which the Constitution and subsequent amendments guarantee to all citizens. But the posse in Selma made it quite obvious that we must further spell out the rights of all Americans.

That is why I have joined today with a bipartisan group of Senators in introducing legislation which provides Federal registrars for persons who are denied their right to register and vote because of their race.

The bill provides for Federal registrars to be appointed by the President in areas where the number of Americans of any one race who are registered to vote is less than one-quarter of the total number of Americans of that race residing in that voting district.

It would also provide for Federal registrars on the petition of 20 persons where the voting district is one in which less than half of the total number of all persons of voting age voted in the November 1964 election.

This legislation would also outlaw literacy and other tests in those States where the number of Americans of any one race who are registered to vote in November 1964, was less than half of the total number of Americans of that race of voting age, or where less than half of all voting-age residents voted in the 1964 election. It would also prohibit poll taxes.

These measures would eliminate once and for all the insidious methods of limiting the vote to a select few and would constitute another step toward making the land of the free a land where all men are truly free to vote.

BELOIT COLLEGE STUDENTS MARCH 50 MILES IN SYMPATHY WITH SELMA PROTEST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President on Tuesday, March 9, a group of Beloit College students marched from Beloit, Wis., 50 miles over a wintry Wisconsin highway to Madison in sympathy with the Selma, Ala., demonstrators.

The Beloit students not only called their march an expression of sympathy with those protesting the denial of their rights of franchise in the South but as one of them put it, "a demonstration of freedom in Wisconsin" and an expression of "their gratitude and pleasure in living in a State where citizens can freely congregate and march on a public highway."

Mr. President this is the kind of wholesome, healthy expression of American freedom at its best. It happened just last week and these young people who trudged a long, weary 50 miles in the cold of a Wisconsin winter—and in support of their convictions represent the same generation that has been called too soft and too apathetic.

The admiring reaction of Wisconsin people to this march was not confined to the Governor of the State and president of the college.

As Elliott Maraniss in his remarkable article in the Madison Capital Times, describing the march, pointed out, it was widespread and shared by highway motorists and Madison and Evansville residents.

I ask unanimous consent that a perceptive and sensitive article describing this march by Elliott Maraniss, of the Capital Times, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BELOIT MARCHERS ENTER MADISON

(By Elliott Maraniss, of the Capital Times staff)

EN ROUTE WITH THE BELOIT MARCHERS.—With aching feet but soaring spirits, a group of 130 Beloit College students walked into Madison early this afternoon after a 50-mile march in the clear, bright air of the Free State of Wisconsin.

When the dome of the State capitol came into view as they reached the top of a hill on Highway 14, a cheer swept the ranks of the boys and girls who had been walking in double file since noon Tuesday.

The capitol dome symbolized the purpose of the march: to demonstrate the freedom in Wisconsin as compared with Alabama, where marchers have been clubbed, whipped, and gassed.

Meantime, eight other Beloit students flew to the battleground of Selma, Ala., to join the thousands there. Fellow students quickly collected $500 to send the eight to Alabama. One of those who went south is a Madison boy, John McCall, 5202 Odana Road.

The Beloit students have called their march "a demonstration of freedom in Wisconsin."

A spokesman for the college said, "The students are expressing their gratitude and pleasure at living in a State where citizens can freely congregate and march on a public highway. They are also expressing sympathy for the situation in Alabama, where they believe the opposite is true."

The students left Beloit shortly after noon Tuesday and arrived in Evansville, about 25 miles up Highway 13, at 8:30 p.m. exhausted but happy.

The students were put up overnight at the Congregational Church in Evansville. They were fed by local residents, who greeted them warmly and sympathetically.

President Miller Upton, of Beloit, telephoned Gov. Warren P. Knowles to tell him that the students are coming to Madison. He told the Governor that the march was a demonstration of freedom and not a protest.

Upton expressed his pleasure with the student initiative that led to the march, although it is not officially sponsored by the college.

Students don't have permission to cut classes, but faculty feeling can be judged by the fact that several instructors are following the marchers by car to help those who need it and to supply coffee and sandwiches.

After the students meet with Governor Knowles they were to go to the Covenant Presbyterian Church, 326 S. Segoe Road, for coffee before returning to Beloit in cars.

The coffee hour at the church in Madison is being sponsored by Chancellor Robben W. Fleming, of the University of Wisconsin. Both Fleming and his wife, Sally, are graduates of Beloit and their daughter, Nancy, a sophomore at Beloit, is one of the marchers.

A demonstration at the main post office was scheduled to start at 1 p.m. under the auspicies of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

The students walked on the left-hand side of the road, facing traffic, as they marched through the open countryside. When they passed through towns they crossed to sidewalks on the right side of the street.

State patrol cars toured the highway to be sure that the students were safe and that traffic moved along. There were no incidents or accidents.

"They're a great bunch of kids," one traffic patrolmen said near Oregon, "I admire them."

Most of the youngsters were dressed in winter garb, but there was a definite difference in footwear. The boys all wore heavy shoes or boots, but the girls tramped along in low-cut tennis shoes and ankle socks, apparently immune to mud and snow.

One pair walking side by side consisted of David Howe, a freshman from Boston, Mass., and pretty Carlotta Creavey, a freshman from Troy, N.Y. David wore boots, but Carlotta wore tennis shoes.

"She's crazy," David said, but the tone was obviously one of admiration.

Tim Morrison, a Beloit student last year, had spent the summer of 1964 as a teacher in a freedom school in Mississippi. This year he is working for the U.S. Government.

Tim heard the news about the Beloit march over the radio in Iron Mountain, Mich., late Tuesday night. He jumped into his car, drove all night, arrived in Evansville just before dawn this morning, and joined the march.

Glen Ridnour, pastor of Calvary Methodist Church at 633 West Badger Road in Madison, drove his homemade bus down to Evansville late Tuesday night. He stayed with the youngsters at the church in Evansville and then drove along with them on the march today, offering a place to rest and refreshments. The marchers stopped at his church for a short time before heading up Park Street on the last leg of the walk.

Passing motorists, who had heard the news of the march on the radio, waved friendly greetings as they passed the students. "The reception has been just great," a sophomore from Milwaukee said.

Warren Hegge, a towheaded freshman from Boise, Idaho, carried a walkie-talkie at the end of the line and was in communication with the man at the point, Vic Friedlander, a sophomore from New York City.

Hegge said the march was a completely spontaneous thing.

"We gathered at the union at the college yesterday with the idea of going to Selma," he said. "Fifteen students signed up to go to Selma, but we had money and transportation for only eight. We chose the eight by drawing straws.

"Then the rest of us thought that we ought to do something too. We didn't want to be left out. That's when we got the idea of marching to Madison."

The signs carried by the students expressed the purpose of the march perfectly. Some of them said, "We march in freedom," "Eight to Selma," "To Madison in appreciation."

The marching pace was a steady 4 miles an hour. A middle-aged reporter and photographer who went down to get a story and pictures were puffing and panting after a couple of miles.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR U.S. SENATOR

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on September 10, 1964, I introduced a Senate joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution dealing with the qualifications necessary to hold the office of U.S. Senator. Today, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, an identical proposal. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the qualifications of Members of the Senate, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 64

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-third of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected or appointed, have been an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen for at least one year immediately prior to his election or appointment.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this proposal provides that, in addition to the other qualifications already in the Constitution a U.S. Senator would have to be an inhabitant of the selecting State for a period of at least 1 year prior to election or appointment.

As we know, each State imposes certain residency requirements as a prerequisite to the right to vote in local and national elections. In 33 States, residency requirements for voting purposes for all offices, except President and Vice-President, are established at 1 year. In two States it is 2 years. In 14 States it is 6 months and in 1 State, Hawaii, it is 1 year or 9 months by registration. Yet, during the elections for the U.S. Senate last year there were two candidates who won the nominations of their party who could not even qualify to vote in their own elections. In doing research on this problem, I found that the question of residency or of being an inhabitant for a required number of years prior to being eligible to serve as a Senator was debated by the framers of our Constitution. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of that discussion may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

IN CONVENTION

Mr. John Francis Mercer, from Maryland, took his seat.

Mr. Rutledge delivered in the report of the committee of detail, as follows—a printed copy being at the same time furnished to each member:

"We the people of the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, do ordain, declare, and establish, the following Constitution for the government of ourselves and our posterity:

"ARTICLE I. The style of the government shall be, 'The United States of America.'

"ART. II. The Government shall consist of supreme legislative, executive, and judicial powers.

"ART. III. The legislative power shall be vested in a Congress, to consist of two separate and distinct bodies of men, a House of Representatives and a Senate; each of which shall in all cases have a negative on the other. The Legislature shall meet on the first Monday in December in every year.

"ART. IV—SEC. 1. The Members of the House of Representatives shall be chosen, every second year, by the people of the several States comprehended within this Union. The qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors, in the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures.

"SEC. 2. Every Member of the House of Representatives shall be of the age of 25 years at least; shall have been a citizen in the United States for at least 3 years before his election; and shall be, at the time of his election, a resident of the State in which he shall be chosen.

"SEC. 3. The House of Representatives shall, at its first formation, and until the

number of citizens and inhabitants shall be taken in the manner hereinafter described, consist of 65 Members, of which 3 shall be chosen in New Hampshire, 8 in Massachusetts, 1 in Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, 5 in Connecticut, 6 in New York, 4 in New Jersey, 8 in Pennsylvania, 1 in Delaware, 6 in Maryland, 10 in Virginia, 5 in North Carolina, 5 in South Carolina, and 3 in Georgia.

"SEC. 4. As the proportions of numbers in different States will alter from time to time as some of the States may hereafter be divided; as others may be enlarged by addition of territory; as two or more States may be united; as new States will be erected within the limits of the United States—the legislature shall, in each of these cases, regulate the number of representatives by the number of inhabitants, according to the provisions hereinafter made, at the rate of one for every forty thousand.

"SEC. 5. All bills for raising or appropriating money, and for fixing the salaries of the officers of Government, shall originate in the House of Representatives, and shall not be altered or amended by the Senate. No money shall be drawn from the Public Treasury, but in pursuance of appropriations that shall originate in the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 6. The House of Representatives shall have the sole power of impeachment. It shall choose its Speaker and other officers.

"SEC. 7. Vacancies in the House of Representatives shall be supplied by writs of section from the executive authority of the State in the representation from which they shall happen.

"ART. V.—SEC. 1. The Senate of the United States shall be chosen by the legislatures of the several States. Each legislature shall choose two members. Vacancies may be supplied by the executive until the next meeting of the legislature. Each member shall have one vote.

"SEC. 2. The Senators shall be chosen for 6 years; but immediately after the first election, they shall be divided, by lot, into three classes, as nearly as may be, numbered one, two, and three. The seats of the members of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year; of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year; of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that a third part of the Members may be chosen every second year.

"SEC. 3. Every Member of the Senate shall be of the age of thirty years at least; shall have been a citizen in the United States for at least four years before his election; and shall be, at the time of his election, a resident of the State for which he shall be chosen."

Mr. Sherman moved to strike out the word "resident" and insert "inhabitant," as less liable to misconstruction.

Mr. Madison seconded the motion. Both were vague, but the latter least so in common acceptation, and could not exclude persons absent occasionally, for a considerable time, on public or private business. Great disputes had been raised in Virginia concerning the meaning of residence as a qualification of representatives, which were determined more according to the affection or dislike to the man in question than to any fixed interpretation of the word.

Mr. Wilson preferred "inhabitant."

Mr. Gouverneur Morris was opposed to both, and for requiring nothing more than a freehold. He quoted great disputes in New York, occasioned by these terms, which were decided by the arbitrary will of the majority. Such a regulation is not necessary. People rarely choose a nonresident. It is improper, as, in the first branch, the people at large, not the States, are represented.

Mr. Rutledge urged and moved, that a residence of 7 years should be required in the State wherein the member should be elected. An emigrant from New England to South Carolina or Georgia would know little of its affairs, and could not be supposed to acquire a thorough knowledge in less time.

Mr. Reed reminded him that we were now forming a national government, and such a regulation would correspond little with the idea that we were one people.

Mr. Wilson enforced the same consideration.

Mr. Madison suggested the case of new States in the west, which could have, perhaps, no representation on that plan.

Mr. MERCER. Such a regulation would present a greater alienship than existed under the old Federal system. It would interweave local prejudices and state distinctions in the very Constitution which is meant to cure them. He mentioned instances of violent disputes raised in Maryland concerning the term "residence."

Mr. Ellsworth thought 7 years of residence was by far too long a term; but that some fixed term of previous residence would be proper. He thought 1 year would be sufficient, but seemed to have no objection to 3 years.

Mr. Dickinson proposed that it should read "inhabitant actually resident for — years." This would render the meaning less indeterminate.

Mr. WILSON. If a short term should be inserted in the blank, so strict an expression might be construed to exclude the members of the legislature, who could not be said to be actual residents in their States, whilst at the seat of the general government.

Mr. MERCER. It would certainly exclude men, who had once been inhabitants, and returning from residence elsewhere to resettle in their original State, although a want of the necessary knowledge could not in such cases be presumed.

Mr. Mason thought 7 years too long, but would never agree to part with the principle. It is a valuable principle. He thought it a defect in the plan, that the representatives would be too few to bring with them all the local knowledge necessary. If residence be not required, rich men of neighboring States may employ with success the means of corruption in some particular district, and thereby get into the public councils after having failed in their own States. This is the practice in the boroughs of England.

On the question for postponing, in order to consider Mr. Dickinson's motion,—

Maryland, South Carolina, Georgia, aye 3; New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, no, 8.

On the question for inserting "inhabitant," in place of "resident,"—agreed to, nem. con.

Mr. Ellsworth and Col. Mason moved to insert "one year" for previous inhabitancy.

Mr. Williamson liked the report as it stood. He thought "resident" a good enough term. He was against requiring any period of previous residence. New residents, if elected, will be most zealous to conform to the will of their constituents, as their conduct will be watched with a more jealous eye.

Mr. Butler and Mr. Rutledge moved "3 years," instead of "1 year," for previous inhabitancy.

On the question for "3 years,"—

South Carolina, Georgia, aye, 2; New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, no, 9.

On the question for "1 year,"—

New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, aye, 4; New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, no, 6; Maryland divided.

Article 4, sec. 2, as amended in manner preceding, was agreed to.

The term "resident" was struck out, and "inhabitant" inserted.

Article 5, sec. 3, as amended, was then agreed to, nem. con.

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe that the language I have chosen would most nearly conform to the original intent that was expressed by the delegates to the framing of our Constitution.

In addition to the so-called "carpetbagging" debate—which is part of the phraseology which was used at that time—other very serious questions have been raised during my research which need to be explored by the Judiciary Committee or by this body as a whole. For example:

Is there any provision in the Constitution as presently written or any precedent which would prevent a person from running for election for the office of U.S. Senator from two or more States in the same election? Is there any provision in the Constitution to prevent a citizen of 30 years of age to file for the office of U.S. Senator in two States on the same or different tickets?

Is there anything in our Constitution which would prevent a Senator from, for example, California—if the distinguished junior Senator from the State [Mr. MURPHY], who is sitting next to me, will pardon the reference—while holding office, from also seeking election to the office of U.S. Senator from Oregon or any other State?

Is there any precedent or U.S. Supreme Court decision which would prohibit the same person from holding the office of U.S. Senator from two or more States?

If the Senate decided to seat a person as a Senator from two States, would that person be entitled to two offices, two staffs, two votes, and two salaries?

These are only a few of the vexatious and troublesome questions that are posed. It is, of course, within the province of the Senate to refuse to seat a person as a Senator from more than one State. But if the Senate were presented with a valid certificate of election from one or more States, it would certainly make a very difficult problem. It would generate many unpleasantries, to say the least, and a decision to affirm or reject any such certificate would constitute constitutional legislation without constitutional process.

In order to determine the reasonableness and probabilities concerning these questions, I asked the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, and some of the leading law firms in the country to comment. I ask unanimous consent that the text of these comments and opinions may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1964.

To: Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK.
Attention: Mr. Richards.
From: American Law Division.
Subject: Answers to certain questions as to election of a candidate as a U.S. Senator from two or more States.

Question I. If a candidate is possessed of the constitutional qualifications exacted of a U.S. Senator, and is deemed by each of two or more States to be a legal resident thereof, is there anything in the Constitution and laws which would prevent such person from

running as a candidate for a seat in the Senate in two or more States?

No. Since Congress, consistently with article 1, section 4, clause 1 of the Constitution, has been disposed to rely on State laws for the election of Members of Congress, each State is privileged to determine, in conformity with its own laws, whether a candidate for the office of U.S. Senator is eligible to be placed on its election ballots. Accordingly, if the officials and courts of a given State were convinced that a prospective candidate was a bona fide resident, conceivably it would not be dissuaded from so ruling by the knowledge that the courts of one or more other States were prepared to make, or had made, a ruling to the effect that the same individual also was a bona fide resident of the latter, or other States. Presumably, the courts of the first State would view the decision of the others as the product of error.

Question II. If a person were elected as a U.S. Senator from two or more States, is there anything in the Constitution and laws of the United States, or in Senate precedents, which would prevent a person from being seated as a U.S. Senator from two or more States, and casting two or more votes?

It is highly probable that the Senate would construe the following constitutional provisions as a bar to the candidate-elect being accorded more than one seat; to wit: article 1, section 3, clause 3, and amendment 17. The first provision, in enumerating the qualifications of a Senator, stipulates that he shall "be an inhabitant of the State from which he shall be chosen." Since it is inconceivable that an individual simultaneously can be an inhabitant of more than one State, the Senate probably would rule that only one of the several States had correctly concluded that the candidate-elect was indeed a resident thereof. In addition, amendment 17 provides that the Senate "shall be composed of two Senators from each State * * *; and each Senator shall have one vote." The last quoted phrase also would seem to preclude the seating of a single individual as a duly elected Senator from several States, and according him more than one vote, that is, a vote from each of the States from which he has been elected (Senate Election, Expulsion and Censure Cases; S. Doc. No. 71; 87th Cong., 2d sess. (1962), pp. 5, 44; refusal to seat Adalbert Ames from Mississippi on the ground that he was not a resident thereof). Apart from the last mentioned instance, no other relevant example has been found in published treatises on the Senate or in compilations of Senate precedents.

There remains to be considered the highly unlikely possibility that the Senate might disregard all of the aforementioned considerations; and by an arbitrary exercise of its virtually unlimited powers as the final judge of the qualifications of its Members (art. 1, sec. 5, cl. 1) accord more than one seat and vote to an individual elected to the Senate as an inhabitant of more than one State. In so ruling it also would find it necessary to alter its own rules with reference to the maximum number of committee assignments to be allotted each Member; but since the Senate enjoys virtually unlimited competence to formulate its own rules, amendment of the latter to accommodate the Member-elect as the delegate of several States would occasion no serious problem.

Question III. Is there anything in the Constitution and laws of the United States which would present such Member from drawing two or more salaries or having two sets of staffs?

The Constitution merely provides that "Senators * * * shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law * * *." (art. 1, sec. 6 cl. 1.) A companion provision against dual office holding (art. 1, sec. 6, cl. 2) stipulates that "no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

Whether the phrase, "shall receive a compensation," would be strictly construed as barring the receipt of a compensation for more than one seat in the Senate is a matter for speculation; for this provision hitherto has not been officially construed. The second provision is inapplicable; for it refers to dual office holding arising when an officer in the executive or judical branches attempts to acquire and retain a seat in the Congress.

As to statutory provisions, one pertaining to the "salaries of Senators" (2 U.S.C. 36) is silent as to the hypothetical problem presented; and has not been the subject of a relevant interpretation by the Comptroller General. Other statutory provisions prohibiting the receipt of dual compensation are directed principally at officers and employees in the executive branch of the National Government (5 U.S.C. 58, 62, 69–72). However, 5 U.S.C. 70, might be susceptible of a construction which would render it operative as a bar to the collection of multiple salaries by an incumbent holding more than one Senate seat. Section 70 provides that "no officer in any branch of the public service, * * * shall receive any additional pay, extra allowances, or compensation, in any form whatever, * * * for any service or duty whatever, unless the same is authorized by law, and the appropriation therefore explicitly states that it is for such additional pay, extra allowance, or compensation."

NORMAN J. SMALL,
Legislative Attorney.

DICKENSON, WRIGHT, MCKEAN & CUDLIP,
Detroit, Mich., September 1, 1964.

Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOMINICK: You have submitted to us a draft of a Senate joint resolution proposing an amendment to article I, section 3, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States, which establishes the qualifications for the office of U.S. Senator. The proposed amendment is as follows (new language in italic, matter to be deleted in black brackets):

"No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained [to] the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected *or appointed,* [be an inhabitant] *have been a resident* of that State for which he shall be chosen *for at least one year immediately prior to his election or appointment.*"

You have asked whether this proposed amendment, if adopted, would prevent recurrence of situations such as those in which Senator Salinger seeks election in California and in which Attorney General KENNEDY seeks election in New York. As we understand the factual situations involved in these cases, neither Senator Salinger nor Attorney General KENNEDY claims to have been an inhabitant of the State in which he seeks election until immediately prior to the commencement of the nominating process (filing as a candidate in the California primary election, and indicating candidacy at the party nominating convention in New York, respectively). Thus, neither makes any claim that he will have inhabited, resided in, or been domiciled in the State from which he seeks election for 1 year immediately prior to the election date.

It is clear that your proposed amendment, if adopted, would disqualify a candidate seeking election in the future under these factual circumstances.

However, it should be noted that the proposed amendment, could, if adopted, create new problems of construction. The term "resident" is one which has been variously defined in judicial decisions. The scope of these definitions is such that the proposed amendment might be construed to require little more than the acquisition of a dwelling place within the State a year prior to the election, with the announced intention to reside there, but without very much in the way of actual physical presence during the year. At the other extreme, the proposed amendment might be construed to bar an incumbent Senator from seeking reelection, on the ground of his residence in Washington, D.C., rather than in the State from which he was originally elected. Admittedly, these examples lie at the extremes.

However, review of the debates of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 (as reported by James Madison; Elliot, "Debates in the Federal Convention," vol. V. pp. 389 et seq.) suggests that while these examples may be improbable, they are not completely fanciful. An amendment proposed to the 1787 convention which would have required that a Senator be an "inhabitant actually resident — years" prompted one delegate to state that "a short term * * * inserted in the blank * * * might be construed to exclude the members of the legislature, who could not be said to be actual residents in their States, whilst at the seat of the general government."

It is interesting that the draft originally proposed to the 1787 Convention required Senators and Representatives to be "residents" when elected, rather than "inhabitants." This was changed on motion of Mr. Sherman, of Connecticut, who proposed that "resident" be stricken, and "inhabitant" inserted, as being "less liable to misconstruction." James Madison, supporting this change, said that both terms were "vague" but "inhabitant" less so than "resident." Madison pointed out that "inhabitant" "would not exclude persons absent occasionally, for a considerable time, on public or private business." He concluded on a note worthy of current consideration:

"Great disputes had been raised in Virginia concerning the meaning of residence as a qualification of representatives, which were determined more according to the affection or dislike to the man in question than to any fixed interpretation of the word."

The debate is instructive, and it may be significant that after full consideration of many possibilities, the delegates adopted the present provision. Copies of the report of pertinent portions of this debate are attached for your ready reference.

You have also asked whether there is "anything in the present Constitution or Federal precedents which would prohibit one person * * * from being elected in the same election as U.S. Senator from two or more States * * * [or] * * * from seeking election as a U.S. Senator in another State while holding office as a U.S. Senator." We have not had time to research these questions adequately, and have advised you that we are not able to give our opinion with respect to these points. You have nevertheless requested that we repeat here some observations which we have made to you by telephone after brief consideration of these questions. So qualified, those comments follow:

It does not appear to have been the intention of the draftsmen of the U.S. Constitution that one State be represented in Congress by a citizen of another State, or that one individual could simultaneously be an "inhabitant" of more than one State. Madison, for example, deplored in the 1787 Convention the fact that Delaware had on two occasions been represented in the Continental Congress by citizens of other States. Elliot, "Debates in the Federal Convention," vol. V, p. 210.

However, the term "inhabitant" has been variously construed, and has sometimes been equated with the concept of "domicile."

Logically, one individual should not, at any given moment, be "domiciled" in more than one State. Nevertheless, in at least one case involving substantial sums in inheritance taxes, a single individual was found, in separate proceedings carried to the highest courts of the respective States, to have been domiciled in two different States at the time of his death. (See *Dorrance's Estate*, 309 Pa. 151; *In re Estate of Dorrance*, 115 N.J. Eq. 268, 116 N.J. Eq. 204; *New Jersey* v. *Pennsylvania*, 287 U.S. 580; *Hill* v. *Martin*, 296 U.S. 393. See also *Texas* v. *Florida*, 306 U.S. 398, esp. pp. 410, 411.) It is not inconceivable, therefore, that an individual might similarly be found, in separate tribunals, to be an "inhabitant" of more than one State at a single point in time. The possibility would be greatly enhanced, of course, in the case of an individual who habitually divided his time on a more or less equal basis between residences maintained by him in two different States.

Furthermore, the requirement that the Senator be an "inhabitant" seems, under article I, section 3, clause 3, to be confined to the time "when elected." This might affect the question you pose regarding the qualification of an incumbent Senator from one State seeking election from another during his term of office.

In summary, while the suggestion of dual candidacy may seem farfetched, the technical adequacy of the constitutional language to preclude such dual candidacy is a question which cannot be answered casually. As indicated above, we do not express our opinion on these questions.

As a practical matter, of course, it is not to be expected that the people of two different States would be disposed to share a Senator, even if he were given two votes, and the possibility of such dual election seems unbelievably remote. Furthermore, even if some form of dual candidacy were successful, the Constitution does give the Senate the means of dealing with the situation. It provides, in article I, section 5, clause 1, that "Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members." This provision would appear to give the Senate ample power to prevent a single individual from occupying two seats, even if two States each asserted that he was an inhabitant thereof.

We recognize that the foregoing is not completely responsive to your request, but we hope it may prove helpful.

Very truly yours,

DICKINSON, WRIGHT, MCKEAN & CUDLIP.

HOLLAND & HART,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
Denver, Colo., September 1, 1964.

Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOMINICK: You have requested our opinion whether, under the Constitution of the United States, (i) there is any restriction, by nature of qualification provisions or otherwise, upon a candidate for the office of U.S. Senator seeking election in more than one State; (ii) if elected in more than one State, could he hold two seats, or, indeed, could he hold two different Federal elective offices? Also we understand that you desire our opinion and observations upon the State residency qualifications for a U.S. Senator.

The Constitution negatively states the qualifications of a Senator as follows: "No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of 30 Years, and been 9 Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen." (U.S. Constitution, art. I, sec. 3, par 3).

Despite what this would seem to require literally, it was early established that it is sufficient if a Senator possesses the necessary qualifications when he takes his seat or oath of office. The case of Henry Clay, who was not 30 years of age when elected, established this precedent. Age at the time of assuming office and not at election was used again in 1935 in the case of Senator Rush D. Holt (Corwin, "The Constitution and What It Means Today," 12th ed. 1958, pp. 7, 9–10; "Constitution of the United States of America Annotated," Senate Doc. No. 170, 82d. Cong., 2d sess., 1953, p. 88). In the case of Senator Adelbert Ames of Mississippi, in 1870, it was held that residency at the time of taking his seat in the Senate rather than at the time of election was a sufficient qualification (Senate Doc. No. 71, 87th Cong., 2d sess., p. 44). This is contrary to the case of James Shields, of Illinois, in 1849, where it was held that the qualification of having been a citizen for nine years must be fulfilled "* * * at the commencement of the term for which he was elected" (Senate Doc. No. 71, 87th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 14–15).

Residency (an "inhabitant" is a resident (Corwin, supra, p. 7)) in a State at the time of election not being either required nor a disability, it appears quite possible that a candidate could run wherever he chooses. If he is successful in one State, he can establish residency there after the election and become one of its Senators. If he be successful in more than one, presumably he can elect which State he will represent, become a resident of it, and effectively deny the other the representation it chose. Furthermore, the Senate has refused to question whether a Senator-elect was a bona fide inhabitant of the State from which he was elected, holding that the certificate of the Governor that he is an inhabitant is sufficient qualification. See the case of Senator Stanley Griswold, of Ohio, in 1809 (S. Doc. No. 71, 87th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5).

We find no provision against this hedging possibility. However, there may be some deterrent effect in article I, section 5, paragraph 1, which we shall discuss shortly.

The problem of simultaneously holding two Federal elective offices is not solely related to the residency problem. In any event, there is no positive constitutional barrier to such possibility. The real deterrent would probably be article I, section 5, paragraph 1 which provides that "each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns, and Qualifications of its own Members. * * *" The "qualifications" referred to do not mean only the qualifications of sections 2 and 3 of article I. A House may disqualify "for reasons that appeal to the common judgment." For example, the House excluded a polygamist and the Senate excluded as a Member one whose credentials were deemed tainted by fraud and corruption because of the acceptance of certain sums of money in promotion of his candidacy. It might reasonably be anticipated that a House would exclude one who sought a seat there plus another Federal elective office.

At first blush it might appear that paragraph 2 of section 6 of article I would prohibit the holding of multiple Federal elective offices. That paragraph provides in part: "* * * no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office." First excluding an officeholder from "either House" indicates that "office" in his sense is not that of the office of a Member of either House. Further the literature indicates that "office" in this sense means an appointive office (*United States* v. *Hartwell*, 6 Wall. 385, 393 (1868)); these are the offices created by the Constitution or by act of Congress and, usually, filled by the President under provisions relating to the Executive Establishment (See Schwartz, "The Powers of Government," vol. II (1963), pp. 40–47, passim).

From the foregoing, it is our opinion that there is no constitutional bar to seeking election to the Senate from more than one State. There probably is a practical deterrent in occupying more than one Federal elective office.

As to the State residency qualification which would be desirable in the event the Constitution is amended to require more stringent residency requirements, we have some opinions and thoughts.

It has been this country's general constitutional scheme to leave to the States the determination of who is a qualified elector but the Constitution has prescribed the qualifications of the elected. We believe it would be desirable that any amendment leave the qualifications for the Senate in this posture, otherwise there can be 50 varieties of qualifications.

A quick survey shows that even for the electors there are very wide divergences among the several States. For example, 33 States have residency periods of 1 year to qualify as a voter. Seventeen States have residency periods other than a year, 2 of which require 2 years, 1 State 9 months, and 14 States 6 months. Nineteen States have different qualification to vote in presidential elections. In some this is as low as 20 days.

It is our feeling that any constitutional amendment should require that the candidate have been a bona fide resident of the State from which he seeks election for at least 1 year and it would be good if there could be built into the amendment or into its historical background the even tighter concept of domicile because this carries with it the implication of a "home." The following two observations of the late Justice Jackson illustrate what we mean:

"Domicile means a relationship between a person and a locality. It is the place, and the one place, where he has his roots and his real, permanent home." *Williams* v. *North Carolina*, 317 U.S. 287 at 322.

"The search for the domicile of any person capable of acquiring a domicile of choice is but a search for his 'home' ". *District of Columbia* v. *Murphy*, 314 U.S. 441 at 455.

If as a matter of expediency it is deemed advisable to give the States a greater share in the residency qualification, we believe that that qualification should be at least the qualification of an elector eligible to vote for representatives to the most numerous branch of the State's legislature. This would get away from extremely short periods of time which prevail in some instances for presidential elections. There may be a very good reason to have a short period for presidential election because of the great national importance of the office. One who is already a citizen should not be easily disenfranchised. As to Members of Congress, however, while they are national officers, their area of concern must include in some large measure the concerns of the State from which they are elected and in order adequately to discharge this duty, they should have had more than a formal or nominal contact with their States.

We hope that this opinion will assist you in answering the questions which you have raised.

Very truly yours,

HOLLAND & HART.

CHICKERING & GREGORY,
San Francisco, September 1, 1964.

Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOMINICK: Your letter to us of August 19, 1964, requests our opinions regarding certain questions arising out of the existing qualifications of a U.S. Senator and

regarding a proposed constitutional amendment relating to these qualifications. Our opinions are set forth below, together with a general discussion of the applicable law upon which we based these opinions.

Your proposed amendment and questions are addressed to the two principal problems of the "stranger senatorial candidate" and the "holding of multiple Senate seats."

As we see it, the "stranger candidate" situation involves a case in which a person, who is not a permanent inhabitant or resident of a State, attempts to establish such residence or habitancy shortly before deciding to run for the U.S. Senate in this State. In this connection, it should be noted that a "stranger candidate" could be either a "complete stranger," as in the cases of ROBERT KENNEDY and Pierre Salinger who have had few or none of the usual indicia of residence or habitancy for any long period of time, in the State in which they chose to run, or a temporary resident or inhabitant who, by maintaining a home, voting status, or other incidents in several States for some period of time, has established more substantial indicia of residence or habitancy in more than one State.

The problem of the "holding of multiple Senate seats" could involve a case in which a person seeks to run for several Senate seats simultaneously in the same national election, or one in which a person who has already been elected and seated as a U.S. Senator, subsequently seeks to be elected as a U.S. Senator from another State in another election.

Furthermore, these two problems will often interrelate in that a "multiple seating" situation will invariably involve a "stranger" situation, although the "stranger" situation will not always involve a "multiple seating" situation.

Your specific questions and our answers to those questions are as follows:

1. Would the proposed amendment in effect restrict a citizen to running for the office of U.S. Senator from one State only, and in that connection is the word "resident" sufficient to prevent the type of situation with which we are presently faced in the Salinger-Kennedy cases?

In our opinion, your proposed amendment would not restrict a citizen from running for the office of U.S. Senator from one State only nor is the word "resident" sufficient to prevent the type of situation presented in the cases of Pierre Salinger and ROBERT KENNEDY, although the adoption of such an amendment would make it more difficult for a person to run for the office of U.S. Senator from more than one State or to run in a State in which he has not established a permanent residence.

2. Is there anything in the present constitutional requirements of Federal precedents which would prevent a person:

(a) From running for the office for U.S. Senator in two or more States?

In our opinion, no existing constitutional requirement or Federal precedent specifically prevents a person from filing or running for the office of U.S. Senator in two or more States.

(b) From running while holding the office of U.S. Senator from one State for the same office from another State?

In our opinion, no existing constitutional requirement or Federal precedent specifically prevents a person from filing or running, while holding the office of U.S. Senator from one State, for the same office from another State.

(c) If elected from two or more States, be seated in such capacity from each of the States and thereby having the right to multiple votes, multiple staffs, and even perhaps multiple salaries?

The problem of the simultaneous holding of more than one Senate seat does not appear to be discussed by any of the authorities. However, in our opinion, a correct construction of the Constitution would prevent the seating of a person as a Senator from two or more States.

DISCUSSION OF QUESTIONS

The constitutional and legal principles applicable to the answers to these questions and the reasoning upon which we based our answers as are follows:

Article I, section 3, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution provides:

"No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of 30 years, and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

Article I, section 5, clause 1, provides:

"Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns, and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide."

The 17th amendment to the U.S. Constitution adopted May 31, 1913, provides:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

Pursuant to article I, section 5, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, the U.S. Senate has the sole authority to judge the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members. However, the U.S. Supreme Court may construe the language of the Constitution relating to this authority (*Barry* v. *United States ex rel. Cunningham*, 279 U.S. 597; 73 L. Ed. 867).

The words "resident" and "inhabitant," have no precise, separate and distinct legal definition. The meaning of these words must be determined by the contexts in which they are used and they are often used interchangeably.

The individual States select their nominees for election to the office of U.S. Senator through varying procedures and filing requirements. Some States, as in the case of California, provide for the selection of the party nominees by party primaries. Others, as in the case of New York, provide for such nominations through State conventions. After nomination, pursuant to the 17th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, all U.S. Senators must be elected by the direct vote of the people. Such election is then followed by a certification from a State official to the Senate of the fact of such election.

No existing provision of the U.S. Constitution or Federal precedent prevents a person who is over 30 years of age and has for 9 years been a citizen of the United States from moving to a State other than that of his permanent residence, establishing a temporary habitation or residence, filing and running for the office of U.S. Senator and being elected from said State if, at the time of his election, he is an "inhabitant" of that State. Moreover, no minimum period of time is required within which a person must have been an "inhabitant" and no State can enact any laws regarding residence, habitancy, or other requirements which add to or vary the constitutional qualifications for a Senator.

No existing provision of the U.S. Constitution or Federal precedent specifically prevents a person who is over 30 years of age and who has been 9 years a citizen of the United States from filing in two or more States for the office of U.S. Senator and running simultaneously for such offices or from filing for the office of U.S. Senator and running for such office in one or more additional States after he has already been elected and seated as a U.S. Senator. However, we believe it probable that, based upon some or all of the following arguments, the United States Senate would refuse to seat such person as a Senator from two or more States.

Multiple Senate seating accomplished by simultaneous election, appears to be prevented by the U.S. Constitution, article I, section 3, clause 3, providing that "no Person shall be a Senator * * * who shall not, when elected be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen," if the applicable Senate elections take place on the same day, because it would be difficult for a person to be an "inhabitant" of more than one State at once.

In addition, the 17th amendment to the U.S. Constitution clearly sets forth that each State shall have two Senators and that each Senator shall have one vote. It appears to be even less in keeping with the historic regional-representational basis of the U.S. Senate to permit the same person to hold Senate seats from different States than to permit the same person to hold different seats from the same State.

Furthermore, since the composition of the United States Senate is stated to be two Senators from each State, not merely representing each State, it appears that a Senator must continue to be an inhabitant from the State for which he has been chosen after he has been elected and during his continuance in office. Therefore, he could not qualify as an "inhabitant" of another State "when elected" during the continuation of another Senate term from another State.

Finally, the provision that each Senator shall have one vote appears to refer to an individual rather than to a Senate seat. Under this construction, if an individual were to hold several seats he would have only one vote with the result that only one of the several States whose seats he held would be able to vote both its seats.

It should be noted, in this connection, that article I, section 3, clause 1, contained provisions similar to those discussed immediately above, before being superseded by the 17th amendment.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

In our opinion, the proposed amendment, while helpful in both the "stranger candidate" and "multiple Senate seats" problem, does not completely prevent these practices for the following reasons:

The substitution of the word "resident" for the word "inhabitant," without setting forth more specific criteria, does not, in our opinion, make the provisions of article I, section 3, clause 3 more restrictive because, as seen above, the words "inhabitant" and "resident" are used interchangeably.

The addition of the 1-year requirement would tend to restrict the practice of "stranger candidacies," particularly in a "complete stranger" situation in which such a person would appear to be barred from filing or running by any reasonable interpretation by State officials of your amendment. However, in the case of a "temporary resident," the 1-year requirement, without further criteria, might not be such an effective prohibition.

The proposed 1-year residence requirement does not, in and of itself, prohibit a person from filing and running for multiple Senate seats. Nevertheless, particularly in a "complete stranger" situation where a person is running simultaneously in two or more States, it would be of some indirect assistance, because it would be more difficult for one person to meet this 1-year residence requirement in two or more States. However, where a person is a "temporary resident" in two or more States or where a person who

has been elected a Senator subsequently attempts to file and run in one or more States, this amendment would not be of such great assistance because such person may have established, to the satisfaction of State officials or courts, a 1-year residence for the purpose of filing and running.

This amendment does not specifically prohibit a person from being seated as a U.S. Senator from two or more States, if he has filed, run, and been elected as such. However, because of the additional 1-year requirement, the U.S Senate might base a refusal to approve multiple seating on a failure of the person to meet the somewhat stronger residence requirements in one or more States

Very truly yours,

CHICKERING & GREGORY.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I do not claim that the constitutional amendment I have proposed would solve all of the problems posed or answer all of the questions. It would, however, serve as a vehicle to explore the entire field and lead the way to more certainty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may lie on the table until March 22, 1965, for additional sponsors.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I hasten to concur in the remarks of the esteemed Senator from Colorado and to congratulate him for taking care of a situation with which I had first-hand experience and on which I did some research.

It is of extreme importance that a clarification of this situation be made, and made quickly, for the reasons which have been stated today and for other reasons, as well.

In my State of California, there was deep concern over the fact that the law was not clear on the subject of qualifications. I feel certain that one of the most popular things that could happen would be that a candidate running for the high office of U.S. Senator should be required to be a resident and a registered voter of the State for a period of at least 1 year.

Senators may recall that my experience was with a man whom I respect highly but to whose candidacy I objected because he arrived in the State, according to his own testimony, at 4 o'clock in the morning, took a room in a hotel, and at 5 o'clock that afternoon became a candidate for the high office of U.S. Senator. This is an example of what has happened in the past and might happen in the future.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Colorado upon his statement. I concur in it completely and hasten to add my name as a cosponsor.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from California for his comment. I had the pleasure of notifying his predecessor, when he sat in this body under an interim appointment last year, that I would probably use his name in the process of introducing this measure. He was in the Chamber and heard my comments at that time.

I stated at that time the very fact that the Senator from California has just mentioned: That the election of the Senator's predecessor was a classic example of one of the objections I was seeking to overcome. The Senator's predecessor said, and properly said, that he had been born in California and had lived there for a long time prior to his election, although he had not been there for many years.

Perhaps the Senator from California would be entertained to know that Mr. Mason, during the process of the debate on the constitutional provisions, said, in part:

If residence be not required, rich men of neighboring States may employ with success the means of corruption in some particular district, and thereby get into the public councils after having failed in their own State. This is the practice in the boroughs of England.

It was from the boroughs of England that we got the phrase "the rotten borough system." This is one of the problems that the proposed constitutional amendment might not wholly solve, but it would, at least, make a large step in that direction. I believe we should rely on the good judgment of the American people and the Members of this body to take care of any other problems that might arise thereafter.

Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] has asked me to have his name added as a cosponsor of the resolution, which I am happy to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. First, I should think the Senator from Colorado would get some encouragement for his resolution by reason of the recent experience in England, where the movement of Members of the House of Commons on a kind of magic flying carpet has been the custom for a long time. The people of England, though, are beginning to rebel against the practice; and the rather surprising defeat of a distinguished member of the Wilson cabinet in the recent election was attributable, in part, to the fact that he was not a resident of the district which he sought to represent.

Mr. DOMINICK. If I remember correctly, he has now been defeated in the last two byelections. Of course, he ran in a different district each time. In neither case was the district the one in which he originally lived.

Mr. MUNDT. He was looking for the kind of district that Mr. Mason had in mind so long ago.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES TONIGHT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk House Concurrent Resolution 352 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 352), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, March 15, 1965, at 9 o'clock postmeridian, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

RECESS TO 8:25 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate, under the previous order, stand in recess until 8:25 this evening.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the previous order, until 8:25 p.m., the same day.

At 8 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m., on the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Vice President.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, the Chair appoints as members of the committee on Reorganization, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by its Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives, to hear

the message of the President of the United States.

(The message of the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to a joint session of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered, at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m., the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, March 16, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 15, 1965:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Verdi Beethoven Barnes, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Russell Lowell Vittrup, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Vernon Price Mock, [redacted], U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Paul R. Tyler	Bruno A. Hochmuth
William J. VanRyzin	William R. Collins
William T. Fairbourn	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

John G. Bouker	Joseph L. Stewart
Norman J. Anderson	John P. Coursey
Keith B. McCutcheon	Joseph S. Reynaud
Ronald R. Van-Stockum	William K. Jones
	Hugh M. Elwood

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

George E. Tomlinson
John L. Winston

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Charles F. Duchein
Sidney S. McMath

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

J. B. Skates, Bessemer, Ala., in place of M. E. Baird, retired.

Ralph L. Newsom, Georgiana, Ala., in place of Herman Pride, retired.

Agnes J. Thompson, Midway, Ala., in place of E. D. King, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Michael E. Neish, Crescent City, Calif., in place of M. B. Ellis, retired.

Roscoe J. King, Indio, Calif., in place of D. P. Furgeson, retired.

Lucius D. Davis, Morongo Valley, Calif., in place of V. C. McCracken, retired.

Joseph J. Morabito, San Martin, Calif., in place of W. B. Sheldon, retired.

Emeret M. Beltrami, Soulsbyville, Calif., in place of E. R. Campbell, retired.

COLORADO

Claudius E. Allbee, Alamosa, Colo., in place of H. E. May, deceased.

Ole H. Lee, Arriba, Colo., in place of J. R. Kraxberger, deceased.

Hattie A. Myers, Association Camp, Colo., in place of D. B. Byrd, retired.

Laurell E. Julius, Evergreen, Colo., in place of A. J. Elmgreen, retired.

Wilbur D. Kaufman, Genoa, Colo., in place of Mary Stramp, retired.

Norman H. Ely, Golden, Colo., in place of Z. M. Pike, retired.

Clifford E. Anderson, Grover, Colo., in place of W. L. Robbins, transferred.

Margaret S. Willits, Haswell, Colo., in place of J. E. Johnson, retired.

Cletus M. Gilleland, Manassa, Colo., in place of Frank Brady, retired.

GEORGIA

Harry L. King, Brinson, Ga., in place of J. D. Watts, transferred.

Clifford A. Pickens, Fitzgerald, Ga., in place of J. J. Pryor, retired.

Lindsey H. Epps, Marietta, Ga., in place of P. E. Cody, retired.

Fred L. Cowart, Metter, Ga., in place of P. L. Miles, deceased.

Helen M. O'Hearn, Parrott, Ga., in place of W. H. Marshall, retired.

Ernest L. O'Brien, Surrency, Ga., in place of Carr McLemore, retired.

IDAHO

Paul M. Thornton, Clark Fork, Idaho, in place of E. W. Nowlin, retired.

Margene S. Altom, Oakley, Idaho, in place of D. B. Howells, retired.

ILLINOIS

Joseph E. Cavalier, Maywood, Ill., in place of R. T. Gavin, retired.

George R. Kohlmiller, Moro, Ill., in place of M. E. Ayres, resigned.

INDIANA

James R. Zoll, Bluffton, Ind., in place of Roy Biberstine, retired.

Robert L. Lewis, Campbellsburg, Ind., in place of N. P. Lewis, retired.

Verl L. Gray, Sidney, Ind., in place of F. R. Jellison, retired.

IOWA

Dennis S. Brannan, Coon Rapids, Iowa, in place of L. C. Bowman, deceased.

Thomas L. McDermott, Oto, Iowa, in place of C. P. McKenna, deceased.

Roger E. McCormick, Rinwick, Iowa, in place of L. P. Mimbach, retired.

Joseph R. Gamble, Spirit Lake, Iowa, in place of E. E. Shelledy, retired.

Maurice A. Clemens, West Point, Iowa, in place of M. C. Schuck, retired.

KANSAS

Philip E. Travis, Eskridge, Kans., in place of F. L. Robinson, retired.

Blanche L. Bell, Isabel, Kansas., in place of E. D. Thompson, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Robert L. Collier, Crittenden, Ky., in place of W. H. Lillard, resigned.

Louis A. Runyon, Pikeville, Ky., in place of Grant Phillips, Jr., retired.

MAINE

Donald S. Bradstreet, Albion, Maine, in place of V. G. Clark, retired.

Everett B. Lenentine, Monticello, Maine, in place of O. F. Temple, retired.

Robert L. Sutherland, Portage, Maine, in place of Phoebe Stevens, retired.

MARYLAND

Alice I. Baker, Saint James, Md., in place of G. P. Bloom, retired.

MICHIGAN

Dorothy M. Carrington, Bay Port, Mich., in place of B. C. McLeish, retired.

MINNESOTA

Marian L. Peterson, Afton, Minn., in place of H. R. Peterson, deceased.

Thomas E. Devine, Belle Plaine, Minn., in place of J. G. McRaith, retired.

James R. Maalis, Crosby, Minn., in place of K. J. Hasskamp, deceased.

Delbert E. Lutterman, Sherburn, Minn., in place of P. D. McCarron, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Raoul K. Read, Louin, Miss., in place of H. A. Kennedy, retired.

MISSOURI

John E. Daniels, Kirksville, Mo., in place of L. B. Funk, retired.

David A. Hoverson, Saint Joseph, Mo., in place of T. J. Quinn, retired.

NEBRASKA

Lois I. Huffer, Monroe, Nebr., in place of R. T. Fleming, retired.

NEVADA

Ardith C. Burrell, Crystal Bay, Nev., in place of V. L. Wood, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Eva D. Young, Center Harbor, N.H., in place of H. F. Smith, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Alfred W. Conrads, Andover, N.J., in place of E. D. Hill, retired.

Helen B. Milne, Elwood, N.J., in place of E. F. Bozarth, retired.

Allan George, Hazlet, N.J., in place of J. R. L. Jackson, retired.

Philip Serpico, Keyport, N.J., in place of H. T. Hopkins, retired.

Patricia A. Caul, Wallpack Center, N.J., in place of E. B. Rosenkrans, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Betty C. Ortega, Prewitt, N. Mex., in place of I. G. Fullerton, retired.

NEW YORK

William H. Roberts, Blossvale, N.Y., in place of B. D. Ritter, deceased.

Elizabeth D. Baker, Setauket, N.Y., in place of K. D. Woods, resigned.

William W. Thomas, Stittville, N.Y., in place of J. C. Blust, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Marvin A. Rivenbark, Currie, N.C., in place of W. E. Newton, transferred.

Frank Ramsey, Marshall, N.C., in place of Grace Freeman, retired.

William R. Ray, Nakina, N.C., in place of L. C. Ward, retired.

OHIO

Lloyd O. Smith, Little Hocking, Ohio, in place of M. C. Sellars, retired.

OKLAHOMA

William I. Rains, Krebs, Okla., in place of Josie Michael, retired.

Dorothy W. Orr, Mill Creek, Okla., in place of P. L. Bulman, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

William F. Jung, Baden, Pa., in place of Richard Wilson, deceased.

Richard C. McLaughlin, Corry, Pa., in place of J. P. Sullivan, deceased.

Nicholas C. Nachman, East Springfield, Pa., in place of M. G. Spencer, retired.

Eslie L. Emerson, Genesee, Pa., in place of B. M. Fitzstephens, retired.

William H. Couch, Greenville, Pa., in place of J. W. Reznor, retired.

Russell R. Weaver, Jackson Center, Pa., in place of J. H. McConnell, retired.

Charles M. Griffith, Mahaffey, Pa., in place of W. L. Stephenson, deceased.

Donald J. Bogert, North East, Pa., in place of L. A. Clavin, retired.

Thomas H. Beagle, Riverside, Pa., in place of A. C. Gulick, retired.

Walter S. Morrison, Jr., Transfer, Pa., in place of R. D. Heile, retired.

Morris F. Good, Williamsport, Pa., in place of J. M. Good, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Maurice N. Valois, Manville, R.I., in place of E. J. Peloquin, retired.

TENNESSEE

John C. Shelton, Charleston, Tenn., in place of T. M. Bryant, retired.

James C. Tyner, Dunlap, Tenn., in place of V. W. Mansfield, retired.

Willis R. Byrd, Sneedville, Tenn., in place of R. C. Hopkins, transferred.

TEXAS

Fayteen Moorhouse, Benjamin, Tex., in place of T. R. West, deceased.

Glen A. McDonald, Friendswood, Tex., in place of E. D. Cline, deceased.

Milburn B. Holmes, Joaquin, Tex., in place of J. T. Holmes, retired.

Ernest J. Ohnemus, Lubbock, Tex., in place of A. H. Howard, retired.

Lloyd E. Raburn, Valley Mills, Tex., in place of D. V. Farmer, transferred.

UTAH

Gertrude B. Turner, Jensen, Utah, in place of R. P. Haslem, retired.

VERMONT

Timothy M. Donahue, Jr., Northfield, Vt., in place of T. M. Donahue, retired.

VIRGINIA

Mary C. Trainham, Beaverdam, Va., in place of S. C. Lowry, resigned.

Edward S. Hampton, Hillsville, Va., in place of Clinton Webb, Jr., deceased.

Henly C. Davis, Woodlawn, Va., in place of A. R. Brown, retired.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Gustave Frorup, Christiansted, V.I., in place of W. R. Armstrong, retired.

WASHINGTON

Ethel J. Miller, Colbert, Wash., in place of H. W. Miller, retired.

Thelma M. Erickson, Ocean City, Wash., in place of N. C. Rutherford, retired.

Asa L. Baker, Seaview, Wash., in place of Arloene Marchant, retired.

WISCONSIN

Norbert H. Hillebrand, Cross Plains, Wis., in place of J. F. Bowar, deceased.

Robert L. Seifert, Eagle River, Wis., in place of Erna Bond, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used these words of Nehemiah 2: 20: *The God of heaven, he will prosper us; therefore we his servants will arise and build.*

Almighty God, as we turn to Thee, we penitently acknowledge that we frequently suffer so much of loss in peace and power because we have not availed ourselves of the nourishing silences of meditation and prayer.

Inspire us to see our daily tasks and responsibilities in the right perspective and may we discharge them faithfully and enjoy the poise and patience which comes from taking hold of a hard task courageously and seeing it through.

Grant that the people of our beloved country may carry on with united action and effort in behalf of a more blessed spiritual life and a nobler social order.

We pray that our President, our Speaker, and all who hold positions of trust and authority may be men and women of power, of capacity, of courage, and vision as they seek to provide moral leadership in days of crises in our national history.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 11, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1496. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

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

S. 42. An act for the relief of George Tilson Weed;

S. 154. An act for the relief of Luisa G. Valdez;

S. 196. An act for the relief of Georges Fraise;

S. 200. An act for the relief of Francesco Mira;

S. 243. An act for the relief of Kalliope Kostides;

S. 244. An act for the relief of Charles Chung Chi Lee and Julia Lee;

S. 262. An act for the relief of Milagros Aragon Neri;

S. 320. An act for the relief of Denis Ryan;

S. 373. An act for the relief of Dr. Victor M. Ubieta;

S. 389. An act for the relief of Teresa Marangon;

S. 394. An act for the relief of Alexa Daniel;

S. 416. An act for the relief of Sister Aurora Martin Gelado (also known as Sister Nieve);

S. 417. An act for the relief of Miss Wladyslawa Kowalczyk;

S. 446. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Konyen, his wife, Susanne Fritsch Konyen, and their children, Susanne Konyen and Willy Konyen;

S. 456. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho;

S. 510. An act to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes;

S. 570. An act for the relief of Frank S. Chow;

S. 571. An act for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood;

S. 615. An act for the relief of Andreas, Gregorios, Eleni, Nikolaos, and Anna Chingas;

S. 632. An act for the relief of Flora Romano Torre;

S. 640. An act for the relief of Zenon Zubieta;

S. 686. An act for the relief of Pietrina Del Frate;

S. 694. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Soos;

S. 719. An act for the relief of Ivanka Pekar;

S. 720. An act for the relief of Ivan Radic, his wife, Ester Radic, and their daughter, Ilivera Radic;

S. 767. An act for the relief of Gerhard Hofacker;

S. 769. An act for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku;

S. 840. An act for the relief of Christos Stratis;

S. 856. An act for the relief of the estate of R. M. Clark; and

S. 916. An act for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders.

JOINT SESSION MARCH 15, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 352) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 352

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, March 15, 1965, at 9 o'clock postmeridian, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. With the understanding that it is confined to one purpose.

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

There was no objection.

PEACEABLE ASSEMBLY OF CITIZENS IN DALLAS, TEX.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, following church services yesterday in my home city of Dallas, Tex., a large number of individuals, a biracial group, began gathering at the edge of our downtown area.

Their purpose was a procession through our city streets to be followed by a large outdoor rally in a lovely plaza only a few blocks from the spot on which John Neely Bryant built our city's first building—a small general store—more than 100 years ago.

The procession and the rally were designed as part of the nationwide demonstration spotlighting the event in another Dallas County, our sister county in Alabama, a few hundred miles to our east.