rights of the American Negro citizens and events taking place throughout the country relative thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. Also, petition of Ohio Bell, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of resolution with reference to redress of grievance relating to his civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 1965

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

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

Our Father, God, with the dust of earthly toil upon our face and hands, in this moment of communion with the unseen reality at the center of life's meaning and mystery, we would come to the crystal waters of Thy restoring grace.

As those set aside to prescribe for the ills of an ailing social order, we pray that Thou wilt first cleanse our own souls from mental darkness and from moral pollution. Open our eyes to invisible allies, invincible forces, which will at last bend and break the spears of evil. Even when the sadness of the divided earth creeps into our own eyes and we are plagued with a sense of inadequacy for these violent times which try and test our utmost, stand Thou in splendor before us, like the morning which slays the shadows.

We ask it in the name of the One whose life is the light of men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 17, 1965, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following joint resolutions of the Senate:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week"; and

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to provide for Bennett Place commemoration.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2998) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORGAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HAYS, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. BERRY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1217. An act for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer;

H.R. 1224. An act for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians;

H.R. 1309. An act for the relief of Edward Berger;

H.R. 1381. An act for the relief of the estate of Rafaello Busoni;

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of the Jefferson Construction Co.;

H.R. 1867. An act for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles;

H.R. 1870. An act for the relief of Edward G. Morhauser;

H.R. 2139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes;

H.R. 2354. An act for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired;

H.R. 2881. An act for the relief of George A. Grabert;

H.R. 3051. An act for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt.;

H.R. 3074. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens;

H.R. 3096. An act granting jurisdiction to the court of claims to render judgment on certain claims of N. M. Bentley against the United States;

H.R. 3111. An act for the relief of Victor L. Ashley;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of George R. Lore;

H.R. 3899. An act for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons;

H.R. 4024. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Nelson III;

H.R. 4025. An act for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg;

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

H.R. 4185. An act to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5505. An act to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week"; and

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to provide for Bennett Place commemoration.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 1217. An act for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer;

H.R. 1224. An act for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians;

H.R. 1309. An act for the relief of Edward Berger;

H.R. 1381. An act for the relief of the estate of Rafaello Busoni;

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of the Jefferson Construction Co.;

H.R. 1867. An act for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles;

H.R. 1870. An act for the relief of Edward G. Morhauser;

H.R. 2139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes;

H.R. 2354. An act for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired;

H.R. 2881. An act for the relief of George A. Grabert;

H.R. 3051. An act for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt.;

H.R. 3074. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens;

H.R. 3096. An act granting jurisdiction to the court of claims to render judgment on certain claims of N. M. Bentley against the United States;

H.R. 3111. An act for the relief of Victor L. Ashley;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of George R. Lore;

H.R. 3899. An act for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons;

H.R. 4024. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Nelson III;

H.R. 4025. An act for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg;

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

H.R. 4185. An act to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5505. An act to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TODAY

On the request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Presi-

dent of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair calls for petitions and memorials.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I intend to suggest the absence of a quorum.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. May I have the attention of the Senator from Hawaii? Does the Senator from Hawaii see any particular reason why those of us who wish to make use of the morning hour in order to make insertions in the RECORD may not do so and then have a quorum call thereafter?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from Oregon, I believe under the circumstances the rule must be conformed to at this point, because it calls for the introduction of bills, petitions, memorials, and so forth. But I am advised by the Parliamentarian that we ought not to depart from the rule today in view of the motion which will be made later. I think there ought to be a quorum call first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any petitions or memorials to be presented?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 39 Leg.]

Aiken	Hart	Morton
Allott	Hartke	Mundt
Anderson	Hayden	Murphy
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bass	Hill	Nelson
Bayh	Holland	Neuberger
Bible	Hruska	Pastore
Boggs	Inouye	Pearson
Brewster	Jackson	Pell
Burdick	Javits	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Carlson	Kennedy, Mass.	Robertson
Case	Kuchel	Scott
Clark	Lausche	Simpson
Cooper	Long, La.	Smith
Cotton	Magnuson	Sparkman
Curtis	Mansfield	Stennis
Dirksen	McClellan	Symington
Dodd	McGovern	Talmadge
Dominick	McIntyre	Thurmond
Douglas	McNamara	Tydings
Eastland	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Mondale	Yarborough
Gore	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Harris	Morse	Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have order? We cannot hear the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats, and the attachés will be in order.

The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I send to the desk a memorial from the Montana Legislature, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

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

(Mr. METCALF'S statement appears elsewhere in the RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of standing and select committees are in order.

The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

COMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT ON VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message addressed to the Vice President on yesterday concerning the voting rights bill be read at this time.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 17, 1965.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When I addressed the joint session of Congress on Monday night, I said: "Many of the issues of civil rights are complex and difficult. But about this there can be no argument. Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right. There is no duty which weighs more heavily on us than the duty to insure that right."

I now submit to you the legislation I discussed on Monday night. This legislation will help rid the Nation of racial discrimination in every aspect of the electoral process and thereby insure the right of all to vote.

This bill is the product of many minds and much work in the executive branch and of both parties in the Congress. It has been carefully drafted to meet its objective—the end of discrimination in voting in America. I urge the Congress to turn its attention immediately to this legislation and to enact it promptly.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

ENFORCEMENT OF 15TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as well as Senators KUCHEL, AIKEN, ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BASS, BAYH, BENNETT, BOGGS, BREWSTER, BURDICK, CASE, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, COTTON, DODD, DOMINICK, DOUGLAS, FONG, GRUENING, HARRIS, HART, HARTKE, INOUYE, JACKSON, JAVITS, JORDAN of Idaho, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, LAUSCHE, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MCINTYRE, MCNAMARA, METCALF, MONDALE, MONRONEY, MONTOYA, MORSE, MORTON, MOSS, MUNDT, MURPHY, MUSKIE, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PEARSON, PELL, PROUTY, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SYMINGTON, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YOUNG of Ohio, and YARBOROUGH, I send to the desk a bill, and ask that it be read twice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The clerk will read the bill twice.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I object to the second reading of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida is too late with his objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. No action has been taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled and the bill was read twice at the request of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. HOLLAND. The bill has been read only once, I may say respectfully to the Presiding Officer. I object to the second reading of the bill. The question is whether the rules of the Senate are to be correctly applied or whether the steamroller starts. I await the ruling of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair respectfully suggests to the distinguished Senator from Florida that the Chair wishes to apply the rules, and apply them without favor and properly. As the Chair recalls, the request by the Senator from Montana was that the bill be read twice, and the request was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I beg the Chair's pardon, but I am sure the report of the

Official Reporter will not show any agreement to the request, and I ask that the RECORD be read by the Reporter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join in that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair directs the Official Reporter to read it back.

The Official Reporter (Francis J. McSwiggan) read as follows:

Mr. MANSFIELD. And ask that it be read twice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The clerk will read the bill twice.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I object to the second reading of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling of the Chair is that the request was made that the bill be read twice.

The Chair noted that there was no objection, and the request was granted. The clerk read the bill and read it but once when the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] rose and objected.

However, it is the view of the Chair, unless the Senate feels to the contrary, that the request of the Senator from Montana was a request in fact and in order, as it were, agreed to; namely, that the bill was to be read twice, and that it was agreed to by the Senate without objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana, who has the floor, yield to me for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It occurs to me that if the request were withdrawn for a second reading, it would mean only that the bill would go over until tomorrow, when the second reading would be automatic. The Senate would be delayed an additional day in order to obtain a second reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The statement of the Senator from Illinois is correct. If the request were withdrawn—keeping in mind that it was agreed to—the bill would go over only for another day, when the second reading would follow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the bill, then, on second reading, be referred to the appropriate committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless there were instruction from the Senate to the contrary.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Then, unless motion is made that the bill should not be referred, the bill would be referred to the appropriate committee; is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If no motion is made, pursuant to the rules, the Chair exercises his authority to refer the bill to the appropriate committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield further, I believe that I am at liberty to say that such a motion will be made. It will be referred to the proper committee, and all legislative procedure under the rules will be carefully preserved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the bill the second time.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report back not later than April 9, 1965.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is debatable.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is recognized.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as I understand, the motion is to refer the bill to the Judiciary Committee, the bill to be reported back not later than the 9th day of April.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this is a bill which flies directly in the face of the Constitution of the United States. What is being proposed is an unheard of thing. It is proposed to give the Judiciary Committee only 15 days to study a bill as far reaching as this. Of course, there cannot be the attention paid to it which it should have. I assure the Senate that the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings expeditiously and will go into all phases of the bill.

Let me make myself clear: I am opposed to every word and every line in the bill. I believe that it is an unheard of thing. I believe that it is bad procedure to refer a bill of this character to a committee with instructions to report after only 15 days.

Consider the poll tax amendment. We passed an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections. Some of those who signed the bill took the position that it would require a constitutional amendment. Now, they are backing up and attempting to do by statute what they said would require an amendment to the Constitution.

This bill would apply to only five States. It is sectional legislation. It is regional legislation. I tell the Senate now that when it considers a regional bill, such a bill is suspect, not only in this instance, but also in every other instance. Certainly, there should be study and deliberation. If the committee is dragging its feet, all the Senate has to do is to adopt a motion to discharge the committee and bring the bill back to the floor.

The Attorney General of the United States—if I read the press reports correctly—and all his staff of lawyers have been working for a number of weeks on the bill. The majority leader and his staff have been working for a number of weeks on the bill. The minority leader and his staff have been working for a number of weeks on the bill.

My information is that they were able to come together only yesterday morning. Then the bill was dropped in the hopper, and it is proposed to refer it to the Judiciary Committee, with only 15 days' time to consider it.

(At this point, Mr. TYDINGS took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not see that that is an orderly, legislative process. It seems to me that when a Senator believes he has the votes to pass a bill, regardless of its merits, the roll should be called.

This bill would lodge vast discretionary power in the Attorney General without any guidelines. I believe there is a very grave question involved.

Are we delegating legislative responsibility? Are we delegating legislative power which the Constitution of the United States prohibits?

Should not the Judiciary Committee have the opportunity to study that phase?

The Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have power to regulate the time and place of holding Federal elections. That is as far as it goes.

There is one basic fact: The Federal Government cannot go into voter qualifications in the States. I do not believe that there is any room for argument on that point. That is basic to our system of government. This bill would do violence to that provision in the Constitution.

Is the Senate willing to undertake a study which would show whether it should proceed by constitutional amendment or by statute?

Is that not the legal way to do it? Is that not the proper way to consider legislation?

The asserted basis of the bill is the 15th amendment to the Constitution. The 15th amendment does not provide that the Congress may assert a single standard for voter qualifications for alleged discrimination on account of race.

I call the attention of the Senate to section 2 of the Constitution, which clearly lodges the authority within the States themselves.

Mr. President, 15 days is wholly inadequate. The Judiciary Committee will expeditiously proceed to consider the bill. I remember that in 1960, the committee made a number of amendments to one bill, which greatly improved it, and reported it back to the Senate, and the Senate agreed to the committee amendments.

I do not see how we are gaining anything, but we are certainly destroying the legislative process by this procedure.

I tell Senators now that there will not be adequate or full consideration of the bill in 15 days.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has pointed out that some of the sponsors of the bill, in advocating, a few years ago, the adoption of a constitutional amendment to eliminate poll taxes, admitted that under section 2, article I, of the Constitution the only restriction upon the right of a sovereign State to fix the qualifications of its voters was that the States shall not impose upon those who vote for Federal officials greater restrictions than are proposed for those who vote for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

As the Senator has pointed out, we have before us the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, in 1959, in the North Carolina case of Lassiter against Northampton Board of Elections, which held that a literacy test in North Carolina, which is in almost the exact language used in the bill, was constitutional; yet the bill provides that it will be illegal.

I invite the attention of my friend from Mississippi to another illegality, another unconstitutional provision in the bill, which we need time to consider and discuss.

Students of constitutional law know that the Supreme Court and State courts have held that Congress shall have no power to fix the qualifications of those who vote in local elections, provided they are not discriminated against because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Virginia has a law which requires a voter to pay his poll tax of $1.50—all of which goes to support the schools of the State—6 months before the election.

Is is not true that the bill provides that in Virginia a person who paid his poll tax to a Federal examiner 45 days before election would qualify to vote; and that in that way the bill would nullify our local laws on the subject? That is my understanding of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. The States themselves determine the qualifications of their electors.

Mr. ROBERTSON. This bill violates that fundamental principle, does it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Hysteria Seen in Voting Rights Bill," written by David Lawrence.

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

HYSTERIA SEEN IN VOTING RIGHTS BILL

(By David Lawrence)

Emotional hysteria—the unthinking mood that has destroyed many a free governmental system in the history of the world—is about to sweep aside some of the vital provisions of the Constitution of the United States. This document specifically provides that the States shall determine the qualifications of voters and that the Federal Government cannot exercise any powers that have not been delegated to it by the Constitution.

President Johnson and his Attorney General have presented to Congress a bill whereby any "test or device" established by the States to qualify voters can be brushed aside and Federal registrars—appointed by an agency of the executive branch of the Government—would then register any voters they please.

Actually the Constitution, under the 15th amendment, gives Congress only the power to pass laws forbidding any State to deny the right to vote on the basis of race or color. But it is one thing to stipulate a form of punishment for an injustice proved to have been committed by a State, and it is quite another to deprive the States of their power to say who shall or shall not vote on the basis of any qualification they may desire to set up so long as it doesn't discriminate on account of race or color.

The Supreme Court of the United States, which interprets the Constitution, declared unanimously in the famous Lassiter case in 1959 that the States may, without violating the Constitution, use literacy tests as a prerequisite to eligibility for voting. The exact language of the opinion is as follows:

"We do not suggest that any standards which a State desires to adopt may be required of voters. But there is wide scope for exercise of its jurisdiction. Residence requirements, age, previous criminal record are obvious examples indicating factors which a State may take into consideration in determining the qualifications of voters. The ability to read and write likewise has some relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot."

The same opinion quoted from a previous ruling of the High Court, in what is known as the Guinn case, as follows:

"No time need be spent on the question of the validity of the literacy test, considered alone, since, as we have seen its establishment was but the exercise by the State of a lawful power vested in it not subject to our supervision, and indeed, its validity is admitted."

There is no authority given Congress by the Constitution to interfere in the way local elections are held or the manner in which voters are declared eligible so long as States do not abridge the right to vote on the basis of race, color, or sex.

Yet the bill submitted by the White House and the Department of Justice would permit the Attorney General to ignore any State laws on voter registration. Nothing more would be required than the filling out of a form for an applicant to be registered and given a certification of "eligibility to vote." This would, moreover, cover all elections—Federal, State, and local.

It is also proposed in the new voting rights bill that the Federal Government intervene if any State wherever 50 percent of its residents of voting age have not been registered in the past. Some Negro leaders have pointed out that this will not take care of situations in districts where there are enough whites registered to fulfill the 50 percent rule without any registration of the Negro population. There is likely, therefore, to be considerable controversy on this point.

The proposed legislation is a conspicuous example of an effort to accomplish a reform under the doctrine that "the end justifies the means." But, in the long run, constitutional government cannot be maintained or preserved if the men who are sworn to uphold it feel that they can change the Constitution at will, without going through the regular process of amendment, which requires not only the affirmative vote of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress but also ratification by three-fourths of the State legislatures.

There are some Members of Congress whose consciences will bother them and who will insist upon at least a thorough debate of the bill's provisions and a discussion of the constitutional issues involved. The American people have not yet been told the whole story, and it looks as if it will take a long time for the facts to reach them.

The truth is that if, by the passage of a single law of Congress, the rights of the States can be taken away from them with the excuse that it is merely desired to prevent some possible abuse of power, then the United States will no longer be governed by a written constitution.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is true, is it not, that the bill which has been introduced, and which we have been reading about in the newspapers, is not in printed form, and there has been no opportunity to obtain a copy of the printed bill and to study it?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. I hold in my hand a copy of today's Wall Street Journal, which I believe all will agree is a most reliable publication. Although we do not always agree with its conclusions certainly it publishes facts as the facts are. I call the Senator's attention to these words of the Wall Street Journal on March 18, 1965, at page 3:

The heart of the measure, already much discussed, calls for the Federal Government to take over local voting-registration machinery, if necessary, to stop discrimination on the basis of race. This in itself was enough to guarantee that the constitutionality would be challenged.

But the fine print unveiled yesterday contains another constitutionality novel section that is bound to prove equally controversial: A requirement that a State or local government whose voter qualification law is nullified by the new Federal act must obtain prior Federal court approval before trying to enforce any new law. Johnson administration experts and constitutional authorities at universities agree that no previous law has ever required that local governing bodies submit their work for advance Federal approval.

COURT'S STAND IN DOUBT

That section "seems to stand our constitutional system of judicial review on its head, albeit for a worthy end," said Prof. Robert G. Dixon, Jr., of the George Washington University Law School here.

Can the Senator from Mississippi contemplate or imagine any provision more destructive of the rights of a legislature or the sovereignty of a State than that, after a State has enacted a law, before the law can become effective in that State, it must be approved by a Federal judge, who may well have been named by the administration and by the very Attorney General who wrote and seeks this law? Can the Senator think of anything more destructive and far reaching than this proposal?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. It means that voter qualifications in the States will be fixed by the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. HILL. That could well be the result; could it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, it would be the result.

Mr. HILL. This point should be studied by the Judiciary Committee, should it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course. It is necessary to take time to study it and go into these matters.

Mr. HILL. In time it might apply not only to certain States, to which it is intended to be applied, but it might apply also in many of the other 50 States of the Union. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. It will in time, of course.

Mr. HILL. As Professor Dixon states, we are standing it on its head, which means destruction.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to preface my questions with a statement. It is unthinkable to the Senator from Mississippi, who has had an opportunity to make only a quick examination of the major provisions of the bill, that Members of the Senate who are versed in the law would hastily send the bill to committee with a limitation or restriction attached to it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. The restriction in the bill is 2 weeks. That is a pitiful thing, if we really mean to study a proposal of this magnitude.

I invite the Senator's attention to the top of page 11 of the bill, to illustrate what I mean. At the top of page 11, in section 11, paragraph (b), there appear these unparalleled words.

No court other than the District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment or any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provision of this Act or any action of any Federal officer or employee pursuant hereto.

In bold type is printed a provision that throughout the 50 States, from Hawaii to Alaska, from New York to Florida, any order restraining a provision of this act would have to be argued before the District Court for the District of Columbia in Washington, for adjudication and determination.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is unheard of.

Mr. STENNIS. It applies also to the Federal officer or the employee pursuant thereto. Is it not unthinkable that a matter like that should be proposed and referred to a committee?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is unthinkable; it would set a precedent that would cause great damage in the future.

Mr. STENNIS. It would open the floodgates. With the pressure of the times and the demands on the President of the United States, where would we stop, or would there be any way to stop it?

Mr. EASTLAND. There could not be.

MR. HAUGERUD'S TRIP TO SOUTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for an insertion in the RECORD to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, Mr. Howard E. Haugerud, Deputy Inspector General of Foreign Assistance in the State Department, recently returned from a 10-day inspection tour of South Vietnam. The Federal Times of March 3, 1965, contained an article on Mr. Haugerud's trip and the work of U.S. civilians in South Vietnam entitled "Dedicated Workers Conquer Hazards." In the belief that the article will assist the Members of this body in their continuing study of our effort in South Vietnam, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEDICATED WORKERS CONQUER HAZARDS

WASHINGTON.—Neither adverse climate, sniper fire, nor sneak attacks by the Communist Vietcong deter the American Federal civilian employee from courageously carrying out his duties in battle-torn South Vietnam.

So says Howard E. Haugerud, Deputy Inspector General of Foreign Assistance in the State Department.

In an interview with Federal Times, Haugerud—who recently returned from a 10-day inspection tour of desolate outposts fringing steamy, bug-infested jungles, barren wastelands and virtually inaccessible, rugged mountain terrain—had only words of praise for American civilians assigned to these areas.

"Most of these men, many of whom are young and junior in grade, are living under extremely hazardous conditions," Haugerud said, "I do not believe they are getting the public recognition that they merit."

The men to whom he was referring are employees of both the Agency for International Development (AID) and the Foreign Service. Personnel in provinces visited by Haugerud were essentially AID representatives—some of them retired military officers now in the civilian employ of the U.S. Government. Along with the AID personnel were regular Foreign Service officers who had been detailed to AID for a 2-year tour.

AID personnel generally volunteer for areas such as South Vietnam and similar remote Far East posts. Foreign Service officers go to these places by assignment.

For the most part, the American civilian personnel based in South Vietnam function in a supervisory capacity. Some oversee well-drilling operations. Others direct and assist with construction projects concerned with schools, roads, and makeshift bridges.

Or, the Federal civilians might be men who supervise distribution of fertilizer—a factor which resulted in a 50-percent increase of rice crop from 1963 to 1964 in one South Vietnamese Province.

Visiting inspecting general teams shun cities and population centers. To obtain a somewhat clearer picture and evaluation of projects and problems, inspection groups concentrate on talking to civilian personnel in the field.

As for the danger that confronts civilian personnel, the American workers in South Vietnam—it lurks everywhere—behind every turn, every shadow, every undergrowth. Sometimes it is visible, other times unseen.

"One never knows when or where the Vietcong will show up," Haugerud said. "Our people are constantly subject to kidnaping, injury or death."

Infiltrators come in many forms. They might be terrorists, snipers, or members of regular military units. They might even be maids employed in or near installations, billets or hotels occupied by Americans. But these are no ordinary maids. Their "cleaning equipment" generally consists of plastic bombs.

Despite such hazards, American civilian personnel perform their chores unarmed and without military escort. There is no other alternative. Should they be captured while carrying weapons, their punishment at the hands of the Vietcong would be much more severe than if they were unarmed.

Generally, the Vietcong hesitates to lash out against American civilian workers, but only because this may not be to his political advantage.

Helicopter flights pose yet another source of danger. American civilian personnel often find that the helicopter provides their sole means of transportation, particularly in remote areas where roads are not easily passable. Helicopters, however, are a favorite target of Vietcong artillery or small-arms fire.

Whatever the case, neither danger, harassment nor torrential downpours put a damper on either the morale or work output of the American worker in South Vietnam.

Much of the success of the various civilian duties, which Haugerud described as "vital though nonspectacular" depends on mutual respect and work cooperation between village or hamlet leaders and American personnel, particularly those assigned to posts of "Province Representative."

"Often, the American provincial representatives spend the night in the homes of local district chiefs," Haugerud said.

Summing up his overall impression of the American Federal civilian employees in South Vietnam, Haugerud said:

"These men are a dedicated bunch. Their effort is an outstanding one."

Quite a tribute—considering it came from a man assigned to an office whose task is to criticize, in addition to auditing, inspecting and evaluating all of this country's foreign aid programs.

BILL ANDRONICOS.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE 15TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois for that purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senate still in the morning hour?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator does not yield for that purpose?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I shall not speak on the merits of the bill at this time. I wish to endorse the position——

Mr. EASTLAND. I yielded for a question.

Mr. THURMOND. I endorse the position of the senior Senator from Mississippi, and I wish to make a very brief statement on it.

Mr. President, I see no justification for placing an unnecessary restriction upon the Judiciary Committee in connection with its consideration of this bill. I am certain that all Senators are aware of the fact that the Senate Judiciary Committee will promptly begin their hearings and be very diligent in their study of this measure. Normal legislative procedures dictate that a measure of this importance should be considered in the most objective forum available.

The time limitation which is proposed here—15 working days—is not conducive to an objective and dispassionate study of this proposal. Such a short period of time could very well cause the committee to take unnecessary shortcuts and give rise to the possibility of overlooking significant facts which bear heavily upon this proposal.

It could well be that, even without setting a date certain for the committee to report, the consideration of this bill would be completed before April 9. However, if this restriction is adopted, it is certain that the bill will not be reported before April 9. Taking all the factors into consideration, I feel that normal legislative processes should be followed in this instance and the Senate Judiciary Committee be given the opportunity to consider this proposal without being hampered by an unnecessary and unwise time limitation.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have been trying for 10 minutes to obtain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to make the following statement in behalf not only of myself, but also on the part of Senators CASE, CLARK, COOPER, FONG, HART, JAVITS, MCNAMARA, PROXMIRE, and SCOTT.

We are glad to join in sponsoring the bipartisan leadership-administration voting rights bill. It is a strong bill, and in important respects follows the bill, S. 1517, which we introduced on Monday. We pledge our full support in obtaining the most expeditious Senate action.

While we give our active support to the leadership-administration bill, we believe it can be improved in several respects. It is our intention to continue to work for such improvements, including:

First. Extension of coverage to counties, not covered in the leadership-administration bill, where, although no literacy tests apply today, less than 25 percent of the Negro population was registered in 1964.

Second. Removal of the requirement that Negroes, long harassed by local officials, must in some cases again apply to the same officials before they can register with a Federal examiner.

Third. The abolition of the poll tax as a requirement for voting in State and local elections.

As long ago as 1960, most of us supported proposals for a system of Federal registrars. Had our efforts been successful at that time, perhaps many of the tragic events of recent months would have been avoided.

I should like to make two statements for myself. They have not been passed upon by the committee. The first is that the constitutional justification for the proposed act lies mainly in the 15th amendment to the Constitution, which was not referred to by the eminent Senators who have preceded me. Lest this amendment be shunted aside and forgotten, I should like to read it. The first section reads, as follows:

> The right of 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.
>
> SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The action taken clearly indicates that we are proceeding under the 15th amendment.

I should like to say parenthetically that possibly the equal protection of the laws clause of the first section of the 14th amendment to the Constitution can also be used in conjunction with the abolition of the poll tax.

Finally, I should like to say that our approval of this bill is conditioned upon an interpretation which we give to section 4(a) of the bill, providing for the appointment of what we have termed "registrars," but which the administration bill terms "examiners." It provides that after the prior conditions have been met, the Civil Service Commission shall "appoint as many examiners in such subdivisions as it may deem appropriate to prepare and maintain lists of persons eligible to vote in Federal, State, and local elections."

We interpret that phrase to mean that the examiners do not have to be drawn from that particular subdivision, but that they are to serve in that subdivision. If it should develop that the interpretation of this clause is, as was specified in certain drafts informally circulated, that the examiners must be drawn from the subdivision, I shall oppose it. I am quite confident that my colleagues and associates in this statement will also oppose it, because this in our judgment would not insure equal or fair treatment to those who present themselves for registration. It would still permit Negroes to be intimidated by the white racists of the State or locality. In conjunction with the requirement that the applicant must first apply to locally designated registrars, it could make a mockery out of the whole act just at the 1960 act was made relatively ineffective by the refusal to appoint presidentially designated registrars and to require instead a clumsy and ineffective system of judicial referees to deal with individual, instead of mass, cases. We cannot afford a fourth failure to get effective action. Selma, Meridian, Philadelphia, Miss., and other places should have taught us a lesson.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was my full understanding, when this measure left my office yesterday noon in the hands of the Attorney General, that it contained a provision on page 3, section 4(a), with respect to examiners, that they had to be residents of the States in which they were appointed. I believe my associates share that feeling. There is a difference of opinion.

Certainly I assure the Senate now that when this measure goes to the Judiciary Committee, we shall try to cure that so that it will not be said that this is a carpetbagging bill under which examiners from New York could be sent to Mississippi or Alabama. I believe we ought to be in character, and I have it already penciled in the version of the bill that I hold in my hands. It was in my copy of the bill which I had yesterday, and it must have been inadvertently omitted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted that it was omitted from the text of the Celler bill, H.R. 6400, and that it has been omitted from the text of the bill which lies at the desk. This morning I heard the Attorney General testifying before the House Judiciary Committee, say that the bill did not require the examiners be selected from the State or locality in which they are to serve.

If my good colleague from Illinois proposes to say that the examiners must be selected from the State for which they would be appointed, many of us will feel that such a clause would be objectionable, and we shall oppose it with all the strength at our command. We want neutral and not biased examiners or referees. On this point as well as on certain other features I have mentioned, the whole effectiveness of the measure may hinge.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, these typewritten copies or mimeographed copies of the bill are the only ones that have been made available to Senators, except to the elect, chosen few, the apostles who have introduced the bill in the Senate today. A copy was made available to the senior Senator from Florida at 11:15 a.m., 45 minutes before the Senate convened. Since I have had little opportunity to review the bill in all its particulars, my comment will have to be subject to a more careful review of the bill, an opportunity which has been denied me and many of us by the facts I have just stated.

Apparently, it is possible or probable that my State of Florida would not be affected by the bill. Certainly it is not affected by section 3, which seems to be

the controlling section, under which the finding of the Attorney General must be predicated upon the fact, as found by him, that there must have been a failure on the part of the person who has been denied the right to vote "to comply with any test or device, in any State or in any political subdivision of a State which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device as a qualification for voting, and with respect to which (2) the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the Presidential election of November 1964."

Since Florida has no test or device of the type defined later in subsection (b)—no literacy test, no educational test, no test of any of the sorts that seem to be recited in subsection (c)——

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not Florida require, however, good moral character as a prerequisite to voting?

Mr. HOLLAND. As I recall, the provision in the Florida statute is somewhat different. It has to do with criminal convictions rather than good moral character. However, I say again that although I have not had time to review all the aspects of the proposal, I am inclined to believe that the bill may not apply to Florida. Therefore, what I shall say now is based upon the predicate of my present feeling that it does not so apply.

What I shall say is based upon the predicate that, so far as I am concerned, I do not have to state in the Senate or anywhere else in the United States a fact which I think is well known and a principle which I have stood for; that is, the right of people to vote without the hindrance of having to pay any kind of financial charge for that privilege.

The senior Senator from Florida was the author of what is now the 24th amendment of the Constitution. Incidentally, it is passing strange that when 77 Senators, most of whom are at present Members of the Senate, voted for the submission of that amendment to the States, they indicated that to make such a change effective required a constitutional amendment. I find it exceedingly difficult to understand how some of the same Senators who took that position then take the position now that much more far-reaching changes in existing law can be made without a constitutional amendment, and in the face of section 2, article I, of the Constitution, and the similar provision in the 17th amendment of the Constitution, which I shall not discuss at this time.

It is passing strange that Senators who by their votes, and then by appearing before the legislatures of their States to request the ratification of the 24th amendment, indicated, to my mind at least, their conviction that a constitutional amendment was required to effect even so modest a change as eliminating the poll tax or any other tax requirement as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections, now believe that by the proposed statute they can accomplish much more far reaching changes in our political system, particularly with respect to the requirements for the qualifications of electors, in the several States.

Against that background, I wish to make a few comments. My principal comment is this: If ever there was a deliberate effort to downgrade the States of the Union, it is found in the pages of the proposed infamous bill that has just been introduced. Those are strong words. I use them advisedly, because it seems clear to me that the bill does propose to downgrade the States; and I believe it might be well to discuss that point at this time.

Paragraph 2, section 2, of article III of the Constitution provides now, as it always has provided since the Constitution was adopted:

> In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction.

One of the downgrading attempts is the prescription found three times in the bill that before a State can make any kind of complaint against the treatment accorded it in the sole discretion of the Attorney General of the United States, the case must be presented to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

How could there be a more deliberate effort to downgrade the States and to take away something given them by the Constitution, whether a State be a plaintiff or a defendant, in any case directly affecting it—a right to be heard originally in the Supreme Court of this land? That is what the Constitution provides. But such an effort is made in the bill, not once, but three particular times.

I wish to amplify some of the provisions of the bill which I think are truly horrible.

One provision would allow the Attorney General, by his sole finding, to take control of the election machinery and the qualifications of electors in a sovereign State or in any subdivision thereof merely by reason of his finding that that State has what is defined in subsection (b) of section 3, as a test or a device as a qualification for voting; and in addition, the provision—and this is one of the alternatives—that less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is not the Attorney General of the United States a political appointee of the President of the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course he is. Furthermore, the Civil Service Commission has important duties under the bill; and its findings would not be subject to court appeal. Yet both the Civil Service Commission and the Attorney General are truly, wholly, and hopelessly political appointees.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Attorney General hold office at the pleasure of the President of the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. He does, of course.

Mr. TALMADGE. Would it not be logical to assume that politicians, if they thought they might lose a State in the next election, might take such measures as they deemed appropriate to try to win the State?

Mr. HOLLAND. That quite possibly could happen under the bill.

Mr. TALMADGE. Would not the Attorney General have the authority, under the bill, if he needed to appoint his own registrars to carry a particular State, to appoint them and thus guarantee that he would carry that State?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission is given the right to appoint the registrars. The Attorney General might have to visit with the Civil Service Commission of that same administration, or a majority thereof, before he could have his objectives accomplished.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, they are each appointed by the same President, are they not?

Mr. HOLLAND. They are each appointed by the same President. They are each a part of the political machinery of this Nation. They are each subject to the temptations that come with the holding of political office. As the Senator has so accurately pointed out—and I hoped to get to this a little later—this bill would place in the hands of two political agencies, which are clearly agencies of the President of the United States as to personnel, the right to make important findings and decisions against the sovereign States. Then a provision is added which would make these findings final and not subject to court review.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, can the able Senator think of anything that is more dangerous and more calculated to bring outside political control into a State than the authorizing of a political Attorney General to make a determination to send in Federal registrars who can control Federal elections and State elections?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think it would be one of the most dangerous and harmful things that could be done. It cannot be done, in my opinion, under the Constitution. I hope that it will never be done, notwithstanding the fact that an administration which is very powerful now, and a group of very powerful bipartisan Senators sponsor this bill—which I think they will regret.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the point that I was about to make—and I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Georgia interrupted at that point—was that this finding of the Attorney General can be made in large part upon the fact that apathy exists, not that fraud exists, not that people were kept from voting by reason of their race, color, or any kind of device which took away from electors the right to exercise their privilege as electors. One of the alternatives coupled with the presence of tests or devices in the law of the State, as defined in this bill, is a finding that less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of 1964.

I do not know what the situation was in all of the States. I know that in my State, a large number of electors refused to vote because of their displeasure with both platforms and both candidates. We all know that was the case. When we look at States such as the State of Virginia, even the colored people have stated repeatedly that the poll tax was the only handicap to their voting, and it has not proven to be a great handicap there. When we look at the State of Virginia, which I think is truly one of the father States of the Nation, we find that the State of Virginia did not vote half of its total of electors last year. It is a travesty to add something to the bill to provide that, because of a finding of the Attorney General that there is a test of any kind as defined in the proposed bill, whenever in that State, as happened last November, less than half of the qualified people, or the people who could have been qualified, exercised their right to vote by voting in the presidential election, by that very fact, this law comes into play, and the finding of the Attorney General becomes the basis for the appointment of Federal registrars, and all of the other objectionable things, which are so un-American, which appear in the various provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, not only do these words apply in section 3, subsection A, "or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964," but also on page 5 of the mimeographed copy of the bill—and I suppose we shall have no other copies like this hereafter, so we shall have to define these proposals in terms of what we are talking about, as they are marked in sections and subsections. In subsection D of section 5, at the top of page 5, this same philosophy appears. It is proposed to penalize people, States, and subdivisions of States because people are not voting.

One of the things determined by the examiner, upon the basis of which he can strike a person from the list after he has been placed there, is that—

(2) he has been determined by an examiner (i) not to have voted at lease once during three consecutive years while listed, or (ii) to have otherwise lost his eligibility to vote.

It is very clear that one of the objectives of the bill—which is certainly an unconstitutional objective—is to penalize States, subdivisions of States, and individuals, as in the case which I have just read merely because they do not vote.

This is a great departure from any decent, reasonable, or constitutional approach to the correction of the voting problem, which is a serious one in our Nation. The activities of the senior Senator from Florida heretofore—and they will be so hereafter—have indicated that he feels it is a serious problem.

I shall now read from subsection C of section 3, as it appears in this particular edition of the bill, on page 2. It reads:

Any State with respect to which determinations have been made under subsection (A)—

That is by the Attorney General. I shall skip down to this point, and continue:

may file in a three-judge district court convened in the District of Columbia an action for a declaratory judgment against the United States—

That is a clear showing that here, as in other parts of the bill, it is proposed to make the State a supplicant, coming here to appear, not in the U.S. Supreme Court, in which it is given the right to have its original petition heard whenever it is a party, but only in the District Court of the United States in the District of Columbia.

There could not be any more deliberate effort to downgrade States than this effort which appears in so many places in the bill. It appears again a little later, when it appears that only in the District Court of the District of Columbia can any relief under this entire program be sought by a State or any other unit of government. This provision will be found in section 11 of the bill, subsection (b). I read from that subsection:

No court other than the District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment or any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provision of this Act or any action of any Federal officer or employee pursuant hereto.

Mr. President, aside from the things that I have mentioned, another peculiarly un-American thing appears in the bill. I am glad that some of the proposed authors of the bill or at least its introducers, are in the Chamber. It has already appeared that the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois finds matters in this bill which were not in accord with his ideas. The Senator proposes to correct this when he gets the bill before the Committee on the Judiciary. I hope there are many other matters—certainly those that I have been mentioning and others as well—which he feels should be corrected.

The finding of the Attorney General to be made under subsection (a) of section 3 is largely a recital of what happened November 1, 1964, in the election last year. But when we come to correcting that matter, we find that the State that comes humbly to the District Court for the District of Columbia, stating it has enacted new legislation and the matter is now corrected in such State, must show, in addition to that fact, that it has not engaged "during the 10 years preceding the filing of the action in acts or practices denying or abridging the right to vote for reasons of race or color."

Under the proposed bill, we knock out the State, we knock out the subdivision, for something that happened in November 1964.

Not only do we withhold the right of appeal from the finding of the Attorney General and the later actions of the Civil Service Commission, but we require the State, and other units as well—I am speaking particularly now about the State, when it wishes to correct the situation, by bringing in the State or any minor subdivision of the State to show that the offending situation has been corrected and is now behind it, cannot say "it is corrected and here is the proof." Instead it must come to the district court and allege that for 10 years prior to that time nothing has happened within its boundaries or any of its units which tends to go against the principles of this particular proposed law.

Any real review of this obnoxious measure would be impossible for me to do justice to at this time, because I have had only a few minutes to study it, but it seems to me that the authors of the bill should have had available a cursory bit of information about the provisions of the Constitution of the United States or a passing familiarity with the practices in this Nation and Congress, so as not to make themselves parties to the deliberate downgrading, and with it the proposed destruction, in a highly important field, of the States of the Nation.

I regret that this bill in such a form has been brought here, particularly with the honorable names of so many very fine Members of the Senate attached to it.

At least one of those members, an able lawyer, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, has already made it clear on the floor that this bill fails to include one important provision which, in his understanding, was agreed on in the behind-the-closed-door sessions held prior to the unveiling of the bill and making it known to the public, or making it available to other Members of the Senate just before the Senate convened.

I cannot help but express the fervent hope that Senators who signed or allowed their names to be signed to it and who had a different understanding of what it contains than now appears, and who have the willingness to have this deed done, if it shall be done, will want it done in a constitutional, reasonable, and American way, rather than as proposed in this particular bill.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

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

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator from Florida wish to hold the floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield without losing the floor?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I listened with interest to my distinguished friend from Florida. The fact that I found one omission as an inadvertence in the bill certainly does not go to the whole question of constitutionality, nor does it take into purview all the provisions of the bill.

When the 1964 act was under consideration, I had some doubts about the constitutionality of the accommodations section, and I found myself in exceedingly good company, because at least one former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States entertained an identical view. Other distinguished lawyers and jurists had the same view. So I am of the opinion that what we bring here today is constitutional and is definitely predicated upon the 15th amendment.

Senators may not quite know the amount of labor, sweat, long and late hours that have gone into this bill—the distinguished majority leader, busy as he is, with his staff; my own staff and myself; my distinguished associate, the Republican whip of this body [Mr. KUCHEL]; other Members of the Senate from both sides; the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, and their staffs, who came to that office and labored day after day.

What was brought here represents a consensus of long, hard, and laborious effort.

We are satisfied, in view of the fact that we are dealing not with a theory but a condition, that we bring to the Senate a creditable piece of work.

The point has been made that 15 working days is not sufficient time. If hearings were to begin on Monday—and I entertain the hope that those hearings will be by the full committee, and I have the honor to be a member of that committee—we shall have until the 9th of April, which, exclusive of Saturdays and Sundays, will give us 15 working days.

How long, in the name of conscience, do we have to take? We intercepted a bill at the door that came from the House in 1957. I was identified with that. That bill dealt with voting rights, the creation of a Commission, the creation of an Assistant Attorney General, and a Civil Rights Division. I am afraid we did not do our work too well.

I was a party to the endeavor in 1960 and felt rather honored that I had a part in the leadership that took the bill through this body. I probably had an even greater part in the measure on which the Senate placed its stamp of approval in 1964, and containing 11 titles or more. The very first title dealt with the question of voting rights. Apparently, we did not come to grips with the real problem. If we failed, that, of course, must be inscribed upon the RECORD where all can read; and I have no objection to doing so.

But now comes a condition. It is not a theory. We do not interpret the Constitution in a vacuum. In 1870, when the 15th amendment was approved, it was asserted that no citizen of the United States—and I emphasize "no citizen of the United States"—shall be deprived of or denied his voting rights or have such voting rights abridged by the United States, or by a State, because of race or color.

We could be prepared to come into the Chamber with a thousand cases and show that that is precisely what happened. It is almost astounding, the ruses, the devices, the schemes which were employed to deny that right.

After a period of 95 years, we are trying to catch up with the 15th amendment to the Constitution, which in good faith was ratified by the States and was intended to be enforced, because it is provided in the second section that Congress shall have the power to implement and to do the necessary things to give effect to the 15th amendment.

Thus, on constitutionality and on working time, the Senate should be satisfied.

How long do we have to thresh old straw?

For 8 years, from 1957 until 1965, this Chamber rang with arguments and pleadings of one kind or another on this subject. But, this time we come to grips with it. The fever will not subside. It is in the air. Let me read from the news ticker what has happened either this morning or yesterday afternoon in the great metropolitan center of Cleveland, Ohio:

> Street fighting between young Negro and white students today closed one of the city's largest high schools.

Mr. President, this is not a problem in one section of the country. It is a problem in my section, too. It is a problem in my section because there are more colored people living in Chicago than in most of the States of the Union—including those in the South. We cannot divorce this problem and say that there has been a regional, local, or sectional approach. We have approached it from the standpoint of the 50 States in the Union. Having threshed the straw in 1957, having rethreshed it in 1960, and having done so again in 1964, speaking for myself, I am determined that something effective should be done with respect to voting rights.

The very fact that 39 Democrats and 18 Republicans have appended their names to the bill now at the desk this afternoon, is a fair indication of the sentiment of this body, and I hope that we can add additional cosponsors to the bill as a manifestation to the country that the Senate is determined to seek an adequate solution to this problem.

The content of the bill has been discussed. For weeks, many lawyers have worked in my office. We have worked on the problem early and late. There were nights when I did not leave my office until midnight. Therefore, let it not be said that we did not make a diligent endeavor to find the answers.

I caution Senators not to be too proprietary in their judgments for a moment concerning the content of the bill. It always alarms me because I remember what the old wag once said:

> So much of the world's trouble comes from the fact that people have so many ideas that are not so.

Accordingly, let us have 15 days of hearings and discussion before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. If any "bugs" develop, I shall be the first to take a good, long look at them. I did it before. We even got around to the discussion by pointing out that I thought there had been an inadvertence, and that I wished to see the 15-day provision put back in the bill. As a member of the committee, I fully intend to do so.

Mr. President, that is the score. All we ask of the Senate now is to approve the motion in the regular legislative course to send the bill to the committee that has jurisdiction, namely, the Judiciary Committee.

It has often been stated that, knowing the convictions of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, it will be difficult to enact legislation.

I have an affection for the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I have great respect for him. He is willing to stand on this floor and voice his convictions. I am glad when he asserts his conviction, out of a sense of conscience, that this is bad legislation and should not be approved. I do not quarrel with his opinion. I say only, Let us have 15 days before a committee made up entirely of lawyers who will look at every jot and tittle of the bill, in the hope that on or before the 9th day of April we can bring to the Senate either a bill or an amended bill, but at least a bill, which can go on the calendar and which can become the order of business immediately, so that the Senate can then quickly work its will upon that bill. I apprehend that it will go through the Senate by a resounding vote.

Mr. President, with the concurrence and approval of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent to let the bill lie on the table for the remainder of the day, so that if other Senators wish to join in this effort by adding their names to the 57 which are already at the desk, they will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I have the floor——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. I have just been advised by the majority leader that a vote is expected today on the motion to refer. I do not know what may develop in that connection, and the majority leader does not either, but it seems that this unanimous-consent request is not inconsistent, at least, with the purposes of the majority leader; and I should like to make that inquiry of him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would not be inconsistent. It can be done without a unanimous-consent request being made, but we thought we should offer this opportunity to any Senator who desired to take advantage of it who may be absent at the moment.

Mr. STENNIS. Would this consent in any way affect the course of the proceedings today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not in any way.

Mr. STENNIS. It is merely a courtesy to any Senator who is absent for the moment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is all.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have no objection.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the other evening, when the President of the United States concluded his address to the joint session of Congress and to the Nation with reference to the subject matter of this bill, a CBS commentator, who is quite friendly to the general idea of voting rights, made the remark that the bill was a radical proposal.

After reading the bill, it is obvious to me that the word "radical" is far too mild. The bill is an extreme proposal which cuts the foundation stone out from under the edifice which we once revered as the Constitution of the United States, especially with reference to the relations of the States and the Federal Government and the provisions of the Constitution with reference to voters and qualifications for voters in all elections.

It is interesting to note on that point that even though the bill is directly contrary to the Constitution on that point, as late as July 24, 1963, the then Attorney General, the Honorable ROBERT KENNEDY, who is now a Member of this body, testified before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

> I think there is no question that it is in the power of the State to establish the qualification of its voters, and the State does have the authority to establish a literacy test.

Mr. President, those are not my words; those are the words of the then Attorney General, in July 1963, which this bill repudiates and refutes. It contradicts the Supreme Court decisions and the Constitution itself, and casts aside the Constitution in order that this radical procedure may become law.

The motion now is that it be hastily referred to the Judiciary Committee, after days and weeks and months and, with some of the proponents, years of study in an effort to put it together.

It is unthinkable that the Senate, on second thought, would pass such a measure or be so rash—that is the only word that applies—as to blindly act under the impetus of the prevailing situation that something must be done, and try to rush this measure through the Senate.

No one has had an opportunity fully to examine the bill. I state without any hesitation that the bill in its present form is a travesty upon the dignity of this body. We have never had before us such a far-reaching, serious, and precedent-shattering measure as the one we are now being asked to consider. If the measure were passed, we would break down the voting procedure in every State of the Nation. It is the first time that the Senate has been asked to outlaw moral character. I have heard it debated, but I have never seen it in print before.

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

Mr. STENNIS. It has never been proposed that we outlaw good moral character. This bill would do that. There would be no requirement that a person shall possess good moral character before he shall be permitted to vote.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Would not the bill permit a person who had just robbed a bank to walk in and register to vote?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. The Senator always comes forth with a good illustration. That is exactly what this provision means. It is an outright declaration that the Federal Government will not permit a State or municipality or any other subdivision of the 50 States of the United States to require that a voter shall possess good moral character.

The finest lawyers the Justice Department could obtain have spent days, weeks, and months building the case and preparing the language for this bill. Now the Senate is asked to rubberstamp it without full consideration, without thorough study, and without opportunity to explore all of the treacherous provisions it may contain. The very briefest examination, however, reveals serious Constitutional objections which will require detailed study. Let me only mention a few of these questions.

This proposal is described as a bill "to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States." The 15th amendment, of course, provides that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Section 2 of the 15th amendment gives Congress the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation, and the Supreme Court has on several occasions rendered an interpretation of what is to be considered "appropriate legislation."

In *United States* v. *Reese et al.*, 92 U.S. 214 (1875), the Court held that legislation designed to enforce the 15th amendment must be limited to prohibiting wrongful discrimination on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Any such statutes must not be general so that they apply to situations other than discrimination based on race or color.

Section 3(a) of the bill now before the Senate provides, however, that no person in any State or political subdivision shall be denied the right to vote because of failure to comply with any test or device which was in use on November 1, 1964, and with respect to which the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered to vote on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964. There are no words of limitation in this section and there is no mention of tests or the administration thereof which discriminate on the basis of race, and color. Section 3 is simply a general provision that no person can be denied the right to vote because of any test if less than 50 percent of the people in a State or political subdivision are registered or if less than 50 percent actually voted in the last presidential election. Under the decision of United States against Reese this provision is clearly beyond the power of Congress to enact under authority of the 15th amendment, and goes far beyond the Court's interpretation, which has not been challenged until today.

That is typical, Mr. President. I shall refer to a few more sections that go far beyond anything that has ever been claimed or asserted.

Just as section 3(a) is not expressly related to cases involving racial discrimination, it is likewise not limited by any other section of the bill which applies to cases of racial discrimination. Section 2, for example, is merely a declaration that no voting qualification or procedure shall be used to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color. This in no way limits section 3(a) to such cases. Sections 4, 5, 6, and 7, which establish Federal machinery for the enforcement of section 3, likewise do not limit that section to cases of racial discrimination.

In order for the courts to uphold section 3 as it is now written they would have to read into that section a limitation that it applies only where there has been a denial of the right to register or vote because of race or color. In United States against Reese, which involved very similar legal principles as this proposed statute, the Court stated that "to limit this statute in the manner now asked for would be to make a new law, not to enforce the old one. This is no part of our duty."

An illustration of the ridiculous provisions of section 3 may be found by considering the situation in the State of Alaska. In that State less than 50 percent of the registered voters actually cast their ballots in the November 1964 election, but it is generally known that this was due to extreme weather conditions. Under this bill, section 3 would apply and Federal machinery would be set up to appoint Federal examiners and deny the use of legitimate State qualifications. This would be done simply because of extreme weather conditions in the State of Alaska and not because of any racial discrimination.

Section 3 prohibits the use of literacy tests in any State where less than 50 percent of the citizens of voting age are registered or where less than 50 percent

of those registered actually voted. The Supreme Court has held on numerous occasions, however, that the States have a constitutional right to establish literacy tests. As recently as 1958 in *Lassiter* v. *Northampton Election Board*, 360 U.S. 45, the Supreme Court validated a requirement in North Carolina that a prospective voter must be able to read and write any section of the constitution of North Carolina in the English language. In so doing the Court stated:

> The States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised * * * absent of course the discrimination which the Constitution condemns. * * * So while the right of suffrage is established and guaranteed by the Constitution it is subject to the imposition of State standards which are not discriminatory and which do not contravene any restriction that Congress, acting pursuant to its constitutional powers, has imposed (360 U.S. 45, 50).

Of course, a literacy test may not be administered in a discriminatory manner. But the Lassiter case unquestionably upheld the use of literacy tests, and in so doing it affirmed an unbroken line of decisions.

As I have previously mentioned, the Attorney General of the United States, testifying before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on July 24, 1963, stated:

> I think there is no question that it is in the power of the States to establish the qualifications of its voters and the State does have the authority to establish a literacy test.

Section 3, however, would deny this right to any State simply if 50 percent of the people in that State did not vote last November. There is no requirement that the finding be made that such a test was used to deny a member of the Negro race the right to vote. The mere fact that 50 percent of the people did not register or did not vote, whether due to weather, complacency, or any other reason, under this bill would strike down the use of a literacy test which the Supreme Court has stated without exception is within the power of the State to prescribe.

There are many other serious constitutional objections, innumerable conflicts with State laws and constitutional provisions, and other practical considerations which should be carefully explored before a bill of this magnitude is presented to the Senate for consideration. I can see that many weeks and even months should be spent in going over the bill with a fine-tooth comb. Even a hurried reading of the measure, however, discloses defects so obvious and so serious that at the very least the Senate Judiciary Committee must be given a full opportunity to conduct hearings, consider all the points, and pass on the matter without haste, pressure, and certainly without a deadline of only 3 short weeks ahead. Let us look at a view of these provisions, in addition to the ones I have mentioned already:

The bill provides the machinery for the takeover by the Attorney General and the Civil Service Commission of all Federal, State, and local elections. Even an election for a mayor of a community or a city alderman could be involved. This whole approach is clearly unconstitutional.

The States are prohibited from requiring a voter to possess good moral character. Any convict could be permitted to qualify under this bill.

The Attorney General is authorized to certify, upon receiving complaints from 20 residents of their denial to vote under color of law by reason of race or color, that he believes the complaints are meritorious or that in his judgment the appointment of an examiner is otherwise necessary, and the Civil Service Commission then appoints the examiners. These examiners for any political subdivision are authorized to prepare and maintain lists of persons eligible to vote in all elections—Federal, State, or local. The examiner is appointed without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act. He could be a hobo or an incompetent, but he is empowered to administer oaths, and in effect replace the county registrars and State election machinery, and enforce his judgment over that of the duly authorized and constituted election authorities, under State law. The examiner need not be a resident of the city, county, the political subdivision, or even the State for which he is appointed.

When the Attorney General and the Director of the Census make their certification, this is final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register. If there is a mistake, it is too bad. There is no provision for a correction nor does any official who complains about the factual basis for the determination have any right to question it.

An applicant for registration can apply to the examiner for registration, alleging that he is qualified but has been denied the opportunity to register within the last 90 days. However, the bill gives the Attorney General the right to waive this allegation which, in effect, authorizes all applicants to go straight to the examiner without making any application to the local county registrar.

Where a poll tax is required under this bill, the voter does not have to pay it within any certain time or to the official charged with responsibility for receiving it. He can wait until the day of the election, pay the tax to the examiner, get a receipt therefor, and this certifies all the requirements, whether or not it is timely under State law.

A new judicial system is created where appeals are before a hearing officer appointed by the Civil Service Commission. No qualifications are apparently required for the appointment of this officer.

Under the bill, a State cannot change its voter qualifications from those in effect on November 1, 1964. Any change cannot become effective until the suit for a declaratory judgment has been filed against the United States in the District Court for the District of Columbia, and finally determined. State officials must travel hundreds and thousands of miles after their State legislature enacts new laws to seek the permission of the judges of the District Court for the District of Columbia, who apparently have superior knowledge on all voting questions over and above all the State and Federal judges in all of the 50 States. It makes no difference that the State may want to shorten its residence requirement or lower the voting age to 18. The rule is the same. This is a declaration that undertakes to freeze the present law as of November 1, 1964, with respect to the qualification of voters until the State comes to the District Court for the District of Columbia. That is an indictment of the judicial system. It is an indictment of every judicial district and encumbent officer who may be using that judicial power.

I am sure that somewhere there are some kind of precedents on economic matters, with respect to parties being brought to the District of Columbia that arise under the commerce clause of the Constitution and which refer to regulations of some kind. Perhaps that is where the drafters of the bill got the idea of invading the field of legislation, such as the qualification of voters, and undertaking to freeze that law, and not permit any State legislature to change the law except under the condition that the State come to Washington to have the courts in the District of Columbia decide the validity of any law enacted in Oregon, Vermont, or any other State of the Union.

I believe that when that fact gets out to the people and is fully understood, when members of the bar of this Nation realize and appreciate not only the substance of it but also the dreadful precedent it would set, there will be some kind of response on the merits, which will overcome the clamor and the marching of people, lying down in the White House, and coming to the Capitol and demanding that the Speaker of the House see that certain bills are passed before they will leave.

There are many other serious objections to the bill which should be pointed out during the hearings and during the debate on the Senate floor. I shall mention only one other now, but I shall have a great deal more to say on this subject in the future.

I refer briefly to another provision in the bill which is contained on page 11 of the present printed version of the bill. That has to do with section 11(b). I read briefly:

> No court other than the District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment or any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provision of this Act or any action of any Federal officer or employee pursuant thereto.

Only the District Court for the District of Columbia would have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment, restraining order, or temporary or permanent injunction involving proceedings under this bill.

That is another unthinkable provision. An action concerning an employee or a Federal officer who might be carrying out the provisions of the bill could not be brought in California, Texas, Tennessee, or wherever a cause of action might originate, but it must be brought in the District of Columbia, and the case must be tried in the District Court for the District of Columbia. No other court would have jurisdiction.

The U.S. Congress is asked to distrust all the courts in the land except the handpicked judges, with their superior knowledge and closeness to the White House, when any voting matter is involved. It will be a sad day in the country when and if this provision becomes law.

Mr. President, those provisions are without precedent. They are unthinkable. In addition to the harm which would be done by the section itself, it would establish a precedent which would open the door wide for a limitation of jurisdiction with respect to all courts throughout the land. Should the proposed language be upheld—and God forbid that it be upheld—a majority of Congress might designate that any action must be tried in the District of Columbia. The Federal courts of Oklahoma, Tennessee, California, or any other State would have no significance. If we should follow the proposed principle in many instances, the judicial system of the United States would be destroyed.

I do not believe that we are ready to embark upon a precedent of that kind. The committee ought to have sufficient time to study the measure. We have heard talk about granting 15 or 20 days to study the measure. Everyone knows that almost every Senator has three or four meetings which he is now supposed to be attending every morning. He can attend only one at a time, of course. A Senator's time is stretched out now with duties in committees and in subcommittees, on the floor of the Senate, with departments of the Government, with constituents who come here, and with mail that pours in from every source. He cannot give all his time to any one bill. He could not begin to do so. So when a limitation of 15 days, or even 20 days, is proposed, it would mean that each Senator would have only a small fraction of any one of those given days when he would have an opportunity really to get into the merits and study the provisions of the bill.

As I have said, one of the first things that we would encounter in studying the bill is a direct contradiction of the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States and a direct contradiction of the pronouncements within the last year and a half of the then Attorney General of the United States. Employees and officers of the Government have been running back and forth in the corridors of this building, the White House, the Department of Justice, and everywhere else for months trying to put the bill together. It will not stand the cross fire of cross-examination or critical analysis. I believe there should be a proper study of the provisions of the bill by competent members of the committee, including the staff, and lawyers from other parts of our country. They should be given an opportunity to study the question.

I believe the measure will arouse an interest and a resentment which will be comparable to the interest and resentment aroused many years ago when an attempt was made to pack the Supreme Court of the United States.

What are we going to do? Unless a majority of Senators decides to be deliberate about the matter and see that it is really gone into and analyzed by competent men, squared with the Constitution of the United States, and checked with the precedents of the Supreme Court, we shall do a hasty thing that we shall regret.

I know what the order has been. The order has been to pass the bill. Put the bill together and pass it. Do not wait. Do not delay. Get the bill through the Congress and to the White House. I know that is the order.

But, Mr. President, there are three branches of our Government. The Congress is one of those branches. We shall violate every principle of the Constitution and our form of government and every principle that is included in the sacred oath which we were required to take before we were permitted to become full Members of this body, unless we go through all the deliberative processes that will uphold the Constitution of the United States.

We wish to protect the voting rights of all people. I should like to have every qualified person who can become eligible according to the processes of law able to vote.

Some have said that we ought to pass the bill in order to stop the marchers. There will be marchers on other issues. If we pass bills because there are marchers and demands are made, we might as well return to the "iron man" concept and let him have authority to run things.

We do not want to do that. We are not going to do it. We are going to make our system work.

The proposed legislation is a roughshod, shotgun method of trying to cram down the throat of the legislative branch of this Government the proposed law, which does not square with the Constitution of the United States. It would establish precedents that would take generations to overcome, if ever they could be overcome.

So, Mr. President, I plead for sufficient time for the committee's study. I do not have the honor to be a member of the Judiciary Committee, but I plead for time for the Judiciary Committee, as well as for every Member of this body, to study the far-reaching implications of the bill, some of which are shocking. I have tried to point out only a small number of them.

The Senate is now at the crossroads. The future of this deliberative body is at stake. It is a basic fact in our system of government that the Senate is the one place in our Government that can be properly called the forum of the States. The Senate is the only branch of our Government in which the States can be fully represented. It is upon the Senate that the several States and the residents thereof must now depend if they are to be saved from the mad rush of passion that is pushing this bill under the guise of the enraged conscience of the Nation.

If this bill is all it is purported to be, and if, as the President suggested in his message to the joint session, it is constitutionally foolproof, airtight, fully justified, completely, reasonably, and absolutely necessary, then there should be no objection to its being fully examined by any committee of the legislative branch, or by any individual or group whose only purpose is a sincere desire to insure that it does not encroach upon rights and operate in areas which no law should do.

To instruct the Senate to send the bill to committee under such stringent conditions and restrictions as we are being asked to do in this instance, is to militantly march over the constitutional rights of the legislative branch. For the preservation of the Senate, for the preservation of the Nation, for the preservation of our Government, it should not be allowed to happen.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it might have created consternation on the part of some of his constituents for the junior Senator from Louisiana to state that under certain conditions he could vote for a voting rights bill to enfranchise Negro citizens who have been discriminated against.

I was invited to attend some sessions in which the formulation of this bill was discussed. I attended a couple of such sessions, and decided it would be best that I should attend no more feeling that perhaps some of those in the Department of Justice would feel that I was suspect, being a southerner.

It was my judgment that it would be best to wait until a bill was presented to us, and until we had an opportunity to study it in greater detail when more minds had been able to make their contributions, and then undertake to offer amendments to the bill that might seem appropriate in the hope that such amendments could be agreed to.

I regret that the motion has been made that April 9 shall be the day when the committee must report. The executive branch of the Government has been working on ideas for such a bill for almost a year. This is a bill with respect to which the leadership on both sides of the aisle have been trying to reach some agreement since the Congress met in the early days of January. They required 10 weeks to agree on what they would recommend to us. It has not been studied for a day yet except by those who drafted it, but I can point out certain things that are obviously in error about the bill.

For example, the proposed law would be triggered if it should be found by the

Attorney General—and there is no proceeding provided for any appeal from such a finding—that less than 50 percent of the people in a State voted in the November election, or that less than 50 percent of the people of voting age are registered.

If one applies that to Louisiana—and it would be applied to Louisiana, a State which I have the honor to represent, in part—in parish after parish it would be legal to appoint Federal examiners, although the parishes happen to be ones in which the percentage of Negroes registered are just as great as or perhaps even exceeded the percentage of white voters who were registered. In my judgment, that is patently ridiculous. It would seem to me that there should, at least, be a showing of some sort of discrimination. I have suggested that some sort of objective test would be fair.

If the percentage of whites registered exceeded the percentage of Negroes registered by as much as 50 percent in a parish, that might be an appropriate situation in which to appoint a Federal registrar or a Federal examiner. Or it might be desired to fix some other ratio that would tend to indicate de facto discrimination on its face.

Sixty-eight percent of the people of Louisiana are white. If 50 percent out of the 68 percent had been registered, so that there was a registration of 50 percent entirely white, the law could not be triggered, even though no Negroes were registered.

On the other hand, there might be a county somewhere else in which the bill could be triggered because the poll tax existed, and therefore the registration was somewhat low, although the percentage of Negroes registered was just as great as the percentage of whites registered.

In my opinion, so far as the State of Louisiana is concerned, and I believe it is a fair example of the problem, I can cite congressional district after congressional district in which no showing can be made that our Negro citizens are being discriminated against. I believe that would be the case in every parish along the Mississippi River from Baton Rouge, where I live, all the way to Orleans Parish, 100 miles away. The same would be true of all the parishes going west of that line to the Texas boundary.

Why should it be desired to invoke Federal interference in areas where there is no discrimination, when the problem exists in areas where discrimination exists? It seems to me that we should try to relieve people from the burden of discrimination where discrimination is flagrant.

Already three civil rights laws are on the statute books to take care of individual cases in which discrimination may be alleged.

The bill then proposes to give legal sanction to the poll tax. When the poll tax was repealed in Louisiana, a great hue and cry was made against such action. I should know. It was my father who made the fight to repeal the poll tax. If the poll tax is repealed, it will make it easier for Negroes to vote. But the bill proposes to continue and support the poll tax, a tax which has been repealed in many States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. To what section does the Senator refer?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The bill contains a provision relating to States which have poll taxes. For example, the Senator might refer to section 5(e), on page 6.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That section reads:

> No person shall be denied the right to vote for failure to pay a poll tax if he tenders payment of such tax for the current year to an examiner, whether or not such tender would be timely or adequate under State law.

For a long time, it was felt in Louisiana that a principal purpose of the poll tax was to disfranchise the Negro voter. My father made a fight in Louisiana against the poll tax, and it was said that Huey Long was trying to enfranchise the Negroes in that State. Obviously, being less financially able to pay a poll tax than Caucasian citizens, on the average, the colored citizens would tend to be disfranchised by a poll tax. But under the bill, the poll tax device is to be given additional legal validity.

A case arising in Virginia, in which an attack is being made upon the Virginia poll tax, is now in the Supreme Court. Yet the bill just introduced proposes to give additional support to the poll tax device. If the bill passes, I assume it will offer a standing, open-end invitation to the five States affected to pass a poll tax and make it a high one, if they have a mind to do it.

It seems to me that the bill deserves better study. If 10 weeks were required by those who are sponsoring the bill to arrive at the language they are sponsoring, it seems to me that it is necessary to take enough time—certainly more than 2 weeks—to see if we cannot, by debate, by discussion, and by study, arrive at a bill that would be more reasonable and more just, a bill that would seek to strike at discrimination where it exists, and not seek to punish or impose additional power in areas where no discrimination exists.

For these reasons, I feel compelled to vote against the motion to limit the time for consideration by the committee to April 9.

It is said that rights have been denied Negroes for 100 years. If it has taken 100 years for a President to get around to recommending this kind of bill under Federal leadership, we should take long enough to give full consideration to the bill. I know of no earthshaking election that is scheduled to take place between now and July, for example, to require that we should not contribute to the best thinking of all Senators.

It was not my privilege to be in Washington to hear the President address Congress on this subject. I was fulfilling a long-standing commitment to deliver a speech in San Francisco. But I heard the President's speech, and thought it was a good one. However, the President urged us to make our contribution, as we are required and expected to do, as Members of this body. The President has a duty to recommend, and Congress has the duty to give his recommendation its best thought.

We would do much better by taking more time and proceeding more deliberately. Let the committee have adequate time to work on the bill, in the hope that every Senator, not only members of the committee, but also others who are interested in the problem, will have an opportunity to study the proposal and make his contribution.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, no law-abiding or patriotic American citizen condones discrimination against the constitutional right of any other American citizen to vote. The Constitution authorizes it and requires it. Congress has passed 16 laws, both criminal and civil, authorizing, protecting, and guaranteeing the right to vote. In fact, protection of the right to vote has had more laws enacted in its behalf than has any other civil right in the United States. In the period that I have been a Member of the Senate, Congress has passed a law to authorize Federal judges, if they find that a pattern of discrimination exists, to appoint judicial voting referees to determine which citizens are qualified to vote and which citizens are not qualified to vote. Those laws are adequate. They are on the statute books. They can be enforced in all States and in all courts, State and Federal. There is an adequate remedy for any discrimination that may exist anywhere in the land. I will not deny that perhaps some discrimination has existed in our country, but I believe that such discrimination has not been confined to any section of the country. Discrimination has existed North, South, East, and West, and it will probably continue so long as human beings, rather than angels, enforce our laws.

Mr. President, the remedy is not to sacrifice the Constitution and pass unconstitutional laws. The remedy is to enforce the laws that are now on the statute books. This proposal is not necessary in my own State of Georgia. There are approximately 300,000 Negroes registered and voting in my State. Their percentage is not greatly different from the percentage of white people who are registered in my State. That is reflected in the fact that we have Negro State officials in Georgia. We have Negro county officials in Georgia. We have Negro municipal officials in Georgia. The present law is couched in judicial hands. Therefore, judicial decisions would be made by judges as to whether or not discrimination does in fact exist.

What does the bill purport to give us? It would take the law out of the hands of the judiciary and place it in the hands of a political appointee to determine whether laws have been violated.

When we have a politically appointed Attorney General, appointed by the President of the United States, determining when and if Federal voting registrars shall descend into States, counties, and municipalities of this land, it is a dangerous thing indeed.

Mr. President, if we were to have a President of the United States who was determined to carry any and all States, he would have a ready vehicle in this bill. All he would have to do would be to tell his politically appointed Attorney General to make sure that such and such a State was carried. The Attorney General could then appoint his registrars. The registrars could pack the registration list to the degree necessary to carry that particular State.

That is too dangerous a power to give any human being on the face of the earth. I for one would not grant that power to any man in the land.

This bill has been cunningly drafted and carefully contrived. It is an attempt to limit its operations to certain specific States. The reason for that is very clear. If there were a bill to establish Federal voting registrars in all of the 50 States, Senators would stand up and shout it down. Senators are not likely to surrender the sovereignty of their States. Therefore, an effort is made to get enough votes in the Senate to pass this particular bill by cunningly and carefully contriving the measure so that it would operate only in a few States.

If we are to have laws authorizing Federal voting registrars, why should the laws not be made equally applicable to every State in the Union? Why does not the equal protection law apply here also? Why should we attempt to select some States and say that those States shall have voting registrars if the Attorney General deems it necessary, and other States shall not have voting registrars?

We did not have an opportunity to look at the content of this bill until about 2½ hours ago. We have not had an opportunity to make a careful study of it. A cursory examination of it by anyone possessing even a speaking acquaintance with the Constitution of the United States will reveal several unconstitutional provisions in it. First, it conflicts with paragraph 1, section 2, of article 1, of the Constitution of the United States.

The Constitution clearly authorizes every State to set up and determine qualifications for voters or electors. That is affirmed in at least three separate places, if my memory serves me correctly.

The sponsors of this extreme bill say that it is authorized by the 15th amendment. I point out that the 17th amendment to the Constitution was adopted subsequent to the 15th amendment and reiterates the exact provisions found in section 2, article I, of the Constitution.

That provision authorizes every State to determine the qualifications of its electors. The Supreme Court of the United States has reaffirmed that principle time and time again. No Federal court has ever decided to the contrary. All that the Federal courts have ever held is that we may not discriminate against voters because of their color.

Wherever discrimination occurs, there is an adequate remedy. The remedy is the civil and criminal statutes that now exist.

Several unconstitutional provisions of this bill have been pointed out by Senators. I shall not reiterate those provisions. It is obvious that the bill needs careful study. It needs hearings. It needs study by some of the finest legal brains of America, who should work with the Committee on the Judiciary to eliminate these unconstitutional provisions.

There is not sufficient time between now and April 9 to conduct this study. That is a mere 2 weeks of operation. The committee must invite witnesses to testify. They must give the witnesses an opportunity to receive the bill, to study its provisions, and to research the Constitution and the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. That cannot be done in so limited a time.

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

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, what chance would there be for minority views and majority views in this matter?

Mr. TALMADGE. There would not be any, as the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary knows. We had not seen the bill until a few hours ago. The staff of the Committee on the Judiciary must study the bill carefully. People throughout the 50 States of our land—some of them 5,000 miles from here—will want to obtain copies of the bill. They will want to study it and have an opportunity to prepare their testimony. They must come thousands of miles to Washington for the hearings. After the hearings are completed, the committee must hold executive sessions, vote on amendments, go into it in detail, and then prepare a majority report and minority views. There is not enough time between now and April 9 in which to do this.

Mr. EASTLAND. That would be after all of the amendments are considered?

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct. In the Committee on Finance we have had bills not as complex as the proposed bill, which have necessitated executive sessions for as long as 30 days, day after day, morning, afternoon, and sometimes evenings. That was after all of the testimony had been considered. It was merely a matter of marking up the bill.

The Senator knows that this bill raises grave constitutional questions. It is a radical departure from our dual Federal-State system of government. As the Senator knows, it places certain States of the Union in the hands of Federal receivers, some of them to be held there for 10 years. The only way in which they could be extricated from the Federal receivership would be on petition to a district court here in the District of Columbia—no other Federal court. They would have to come all the way to Washington, D.C., file a petition, come in on bended knee, and say, "please, Mr. Federal Judge, can our sovereign State now get out of the receivership that the Attorney General of the United States put us in?"

Those are grave problems. They should not be treated lightly. I shall vote against the motion to commit with a limitation of time. I do not think there is ample time for adequate study, investigation, and consideration.

Every Senator knows that we have no effective rule of germaneness in the Senate. We have seen a small private bill become the vehicle for bills of grave import. This could happen again if everyone were fearful that the Committee on the Judiciary might hold this bill indefinitely.

Everyone knows that the rules of the U.S. Senate provide for the discharge of any bill from a committee at any time that a majority of the Senate so determines. There is an adequate remedy. Why should we send it to committee in such a posthaste manner and say, "All we want you to do is look at it. We will not let you study it. We will not let you consider it, because our consciences might condemn us"? All we have said is, "You may look at it." That is the procedure the Senate is asked to approve, and I hope the Senate will not be a party to it.

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

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has made a most eloquent and able speech.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am grateful to my colleague.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the very first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which was, as we well know, agreed to, at the time the Constitution was adopted—it is really a part of the original Constitution—provides that the people shall have a right to petition their Government for redress of grievances?

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Is not that the best means and the best way open to petition Congress?

Mr. TALMADGE. I think that is a better method than a sitin at the White House. It is far superior.

Mr. HILL. It is a guaranteed constitutional right.

Mr. TALMADGE. It is a guaranteed constitutional right.

Mr. HILL. In order that this constitutional right may be exercised, is it not quite necessary that a committee of Congress, in considering far-reaching legislation of this kind, as the Senator so well described here today, has sufficient time so that groups of people or organizations, as well as representatives of the various States, may have the right to come here, in order to present their petitions for redress of grievances?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HILL. Yet if we adopt the pending proposal, we nullify the provision of the Constitution giving people the right of petition. Is that not correct?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct. We give them a form but no substance.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, you and I live in a time of change. You and I serve in the Senate in a time of great stress, turmoil, and torment, not only across the seas, but here at home. You and I can give dignity to the phrase "Freedom of man." The freedom of man is in danger beyond the oceans and also at home. Whether it be in Saigon or Selma, tyranny against mankind is our fight. It is the American dream and purpose to advance the cause of dignity.

My people came to California from across the seas generations ago to live out their lives as free men and women, as free Americans. All manner of men occupy the State from which I come, poor people and rich people, Christians and Jews, white people and colored people.

Yet the rights of some citizens under the Constitution of the United States for almost 100 years have been ravished in various parts of this country.

I salute the leader of my party, EVERETT DIRKSEN, and the long exertions undertaken by him and his staff to fashion a bill which at long last will provide that in this country color or race is not a basis for disqualifying an American citizen from voting. I salute the leader of the other party [Mr. MANSFIELD], for what he and all his staff have done, as well as the Deputy Attorney General, the Attorney General, the President, and the lawyers representing them, who together have fashioned over many days and nights a piece of legislation resting upon a commitment the American people made almost 100 years ago under the Constitution and amendments to it.

Mr. President, if I am asked what the bill is, I say it is a bill to implement the Emancipation Proclamation. It is a bill to give the right to vote to those who have had that right sheared away by trickery, devices, and duplicity.

Mr. President, I am honored to coauthor this legislation. I consider this an important day in the lifetime of the Republic as you and I, Mr. President, watch the beginning of a great piece of legislation, travel, as it surely will, from here to the White House. To that extent I say it is a day that will live in the history of America.

Mr. President, there is no issue more fundamental to the preservation of this Republic than the guarantee that all our citizens have a right to vote without regard to their race or color. That is the purpose of the 15th amendment. That is why the people of the United States, acting through their respective State legislatures, ratified this historic amendment in 1870.

Yet, for almost 95 years, outrageous and unjustified discrimination has taken place in some parts of our land merely because of the color of a man's skin. This Republic, this democratic society, cannot tolerate such action if it is to keep faith with the precepts of our Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" and "that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The 15th amendment sought to bring reality to the mandate of the Constitution that the people of the United States, in writing a Constitution, sought "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Congress, in enacting the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which I have had the honor to coauthor, will at long last make that promise of 1787 and the later promise of 1870 a reality. We seek through this legislation to provide a means to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The right to vote and to make a choice freely among candidates of opposing views who offer themselves for public office is fundamental if we are to build a better America in which all will share. The right to vote remains man's greatest weapon against the tyranny of both the many and the few. Last year the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that under the 14th amendment to the Constitution, the principle of one-man, one-vote must be applied in our State legislative process. Today, Congress is asked to assure that the one man will have his one vote regardless of the color of his skin or the nature of his race.

I noted earlier that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is truly a product of the thinking of members of both parties in the Senate and the House. This was one of the finest examples of the legislative process and the drafting of legislation which I have witnessed in my 13 years in the Senate. What does this legislation provide?

Briefly, we seek to carry out the mandate of the 15th amendment by implementing it, as we are authorized to do, in section 2 of that amendment where it states that "The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

We believe, as the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has so ably shown in its various reports on voting starting with 1961, and as the Attorney General will testify before the relevant congressional committees, that there is a definite relationship between the existence of tests and devices such as those which require the demonstration of an ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter and the low percentage of Negro citizens who are enrolled in several States of this Union. The hearings are replete with testimony from Negro citizens who were asked to not merely read but to interpret sections of the American Constitution which not even the Attorney General of the United States or those of us in this Chamber could interpret. The hearings are replete with examples of Negro citizens who were turned away by election registrars because of a simple clerical error on a form. These are mild examples compared to what will be detailed in the hearings and before the Senate in future weeks.

Since we believe there is this relationship between such tests and devices and the discrimination prohibited by the 15th amendment, our legislation provides that given certain conditions which the Attorney General certifies to the Civil Service Commission, Federal examiners may be appointed. For this "automatic trigger" to become operative, the State or political subdivision must have had a statute authorizing the use of the prohibited test or device on November 1, 1964, as a qualification for voting and the Director of the Census must have determined that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age residing in the affected area were registered on November 1, 1964, or less than 50 percent voted in the presidential election of that year. These conditions establish what States are covered and, we believe, get at the hard-core areas which have discriminated.

For these covered areas, the Civil Service Commission can appoint Federal examiners to register voters whenever the Attorney General has certified to them that he has received complaints in writing from 20 or more residents of such a political subdivision alleging that they have been denied the right to vote under color of law by reason of race or color and that he believes such complaints to be meritorious. The Attorney General can also certify to the Civil Service Commission that such examiners be appointed on the basis of his own judgment.

It is then up to the Civil Service Commission which has long been bipartisan in nature to appoint the needed number of examiners to prepare and maintain the lists of persons eligible to vote in Federal, State, and local elections. These examiners can be chosen from among any qualified person and need not be a Federal employee. They could be on a part-time or full-time basis. Their appointment can be terminated by the Commission at any time. While serving in the capacity of a Federal examiner, they would be prohibited from political activity in accordance with the provisions of the Hatch Act. They would have the power to administer oaths.

The Civil Service Commission would establish the necessary forms and procedures to assure registration in an orderly manner. The form would provide that the applicant is not registered to vote and that within 90 days of his application he has been denied under color of law the opportunity to register or to vote or has been found not qualified to vote by a person acting under color of law. The Attorney General, because of the large numbers of individuals involved, is authorized to waive the latter allegation.

Such an applicant whom the examiner finds to have the qualifications prescribed by State law, as for example, age, resi-

dence, competency, and so on—but would not have to meet the requirements of the prohibited tests and devices which have been shown to be discriminatory—would be placed on a list of eligible voters. Such a list would be available for public inspection and would be transmitted with such supplements as appropriate at the end of each month to the appropriate local election officials. Each person would receive a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote. The list would have to be certified and transmitted to the office of the appropriate local election officials at least 45 days prior to such election. Procedures are provided to challenge such listings within 10 days after a person is listed at both a hearing officer and Federal court level.

An individual who is on what might be called the "Federal" list can have his name removed by the examiner if he has been successfully challenged or if he has been determined by the examiner not to have voted at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed or to have otherwise lost his eligibility to vote, as for example, if he moved away from the area.

We were particularly concerned that an individual should not only be permitted to register, and to vote, but also to have his vote counted. Thus, provision is made for the application of fines up to $5,000 and imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, for those who deprive or attempt to deprive a person of any right secured under this act. If there were reasonable grounds to believe that any person was about to engage in a prohibited practice, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for the United States an action for preventive relief, including an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, including an order directed to the State and State or local election officials to require them to honor listings under this act.

Within 24 hours of the closing of the polls, if a person alleges to an examiner that he was not permitted to vote or his vote was not counted and the examiner finds the allegation well founded, upon receipt of such notification, the U.S. attorney may apply to the district court for an order enjoining certification of the results of the election. If the court found the allegations to be correct, then the court would provide for the casting or counting of such a ballot.

If it was discovered within a year following an election in a political subdivision in whch an examiner had been appointed that ballots or tallies of ballots had been destroyed, defaced, mutilated, or otherwise altered then the criminal penalties previously mentioned could be imposed.

How would the Federal examiner system be terminated? It would be terminated whenever the Attorney General notified the Civil Service Commission that; first, all persons listed by the examiner for such a political subdivision had been placed on the appropriate voting registration roll; and second, that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that persons will be deprived of or denied the right to vote on account of race or color in such subdivision.

Mr. President, this is permanent legislation, but a State would have the opportunity to show its good faith and remove itself from the jurisdiction of the "automatic trigger" mechanism if it filed in a three-judge district court in the District of Columbia an action for a declaratory judgment against the United States, alleging that neither it nor any person acting under color of law has engaged during the 10 years preceding the filing of the action in acts or practices denying or abridging the right to vote for reasons of race or color. The court would determine the matter with the right of appeal by either party to the Supreme Court. Alaska, which has not discriminated, but which falls within the "automatic trigger" since less than 50 percent of its people voted in 1964 and it has a law authorizing such tests or devices could immediately avail itself of this provision.

Discrimination in voting which might occur in other parts of the country is prohibited under section 2 which provides that "no voting qualification or procedure shall be imposed or applied to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color." Once such discrimination were proven, the criminal penalties imposed by this act could be applied to those who had committed the misconduct.

Mr. President, the one vexing question which was not resolved to our complete satisfaction has to do with the handling of the poll tax. The poll tax is an obnoxious device. There can be no question but that its purpose was originally, by and large, to disenfranchise Negro citizens. However, as drafters of the legislation introduced today we faced a dilemma. The 24th amendment prohibited the poll tax from being applied in Federal elections. It did not cover State and local elections. The assumption was that it would be impractical for a State to maintain two separate lists; yet, that is exactly what they have done.

The Supreme Court of the United States in 1937 in *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U.S. 277), unanimously stated that a poll tax could be levied. It is possible that this decision will be overturned as a violation of the equal-protection clause of the 14th amendment in cases now before the Federal judiciary. I hope that it will be. I believe that Congress, by statute, can abolish application of the poll tax when it is used in a discriminatory manner. In Mississippi, it has been used in a discriminatory manner; thus in the bill introduced today, we have provided that instead of the 19-month-prepayment requirement of Mississippi law, an individual going before the Federal examiner and seeking to register, need only pay to the examiner the current poll tax which he will then transmit to the office of the appropriate local authorities. It would make no sense to require the applicant to also pay his poll tax 19 months before the election when he would not have been permitted to register and to vote even if he had. I am confident further attention will be given this aspect of the legislation while it is before committee.

Mr. President, for years many of us have sought to strengthen the voting rights provisions of the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts. In the last Congress, Senator Keating of New York and a number of us on this side of the aisle sought to have title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applied to State and local as well as Federal elections. We were told that this was not possible.

The results of such inaction have borne fruit in the tragic events of the past few weeks in Selma, Ala. This is not a tragedy limited to one city or one State. It is not a tragedy limited to one man or one group of men. It is a tragedy for all Americans. It is a tragedy which must be overcome and must be rectified if we are to once again walk with pride as freemen and seek to set an example for all who aspire to be freemen everywhere.

Let us at long last put our own house in order. The time to act is now. I am confident that this Congress will meet that challenge and that when the final roll is announced, men and women on both sides of the aisle will complete what Abraham Lincoln started to do just over a century ago.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heard with great interest the many fine statements just made in favor of the motion, including the fine statement made by the assistant minority leader. I, too, am identified with this legislation and am one of that group, to which I am proud to belong, which fought this battle at times when this Chamber was very cold toward the subject of civil rights. We have traveled a long way.

The only issue at stake today is, Shall we give 15 days of hearing, almost 3 weeks of elapsed time, to the Judiciary Committee to report a bill?

Let us remember that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate is known as the graveyard of civil rights legislation. It has not reported a civil rights bill unless such bills have had date tags. This is a time when, by a vote of yea or nay, Senators can show their determination that a bill shall be reported from the committee.

In answer to the question of the proposed time, we must not only consider the duties of Senators and how long they may hear testimony; we must also consider the people who have been denied the right to vote. Have they not said often enough, "How long, O Lord? How long must it be before we have this right?" Even those who are opposed to other civil rights legislation must concede that this is one right which people should have.

It is no secret that the old social order in the South is going. So far as this Senator is concerned, it cannot go too fast if it is based on discrimination among Americans based on the color of their skin.

One of the most sacred rights is the right to vote. We considered it in 1957, 1960, and 1964. We accomplished a great deal in each case, but every time we got to the point of Federal registrars, we backed away. Now experience shows that only Federal registrars will assure these rights.

There may be many laws on the books of the States and of the United States, but they do not guarantee these rights.

It is the function of the legislature, unless it is going to be overturned by the currents of time and history, to enact legislation which secures the rights of the people no matter what other legislation is on the books that is not working. That is the acid test.

A great deal has been said about the question of poll taxes. I say that the poll tax has perpetuated discrimination. This bill provides that only 1 year's tax shall be required to be paid before voting in an election. If it is cut down to 1 year, it can be cut out entirely. That is what I shall be for, and that is what the bill of the so-called civil rights coalition calls for.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator. I have not asked for time, but I wish to commend the Senator from New York for his fine statement.

I pay my respects to those who are responsible for the action we are about to take—an unprecedented action in the history of the Senate as I have known it—by which, without long and tortured debate, and agonizing delay, it is proposed to instruct the Committee on the Judiciary, after a reasonable period for deliberation, to report a civil rights bill to the Senate.

The credit goes, first, to the Negroes and their great leaders; then, to the great leaders in the civil rights movement of all colors, including notably and perhaps decisively the leaders of the churches of this country. To them, for their sacrifices and their leadership, I pay the highest tribute within my power.

I thank the Senator from New York for permitting me to interrupt him to make these comments.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The only question now before the Senate is whether the length of time to be afforded the Committee on the Judiciary—that is until April 9—is sufficient for a full consideration of the bill.

I can think of only two questions that would be considered by the committee: First, Is there a violation of the 15th amendment? and are citizens being deprived of their right to vote? Without question, the reports of the Civil Rights Commission and the decisions of the Supreme Court show that for years the violation of this right has occurred. If there are any doubts, we have only to look at the situation in the South today, in Alabama and in other States, for there the fact of discrimination is proclaimed across the face of the land.

A second question has been raised about constitutionality and about whether there will be time to discuss this complex problem.

In 1957, 1960, and 1964—and in other years—the constitutionality of voting rights legislation has been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, and debated on the floor of the Senate at the greatest length. I cannot believe that this bill needs to be delayed in committee.

I have introduced, and joined other Senators in introducing, voting rights bills in past years, and I have studied their constitutionality. I have studied this bill from that viewpoint. The 15th amendment, article II, section 2, gives the power to Congress to enforce that amendment by appropriate legislation. The bill before us is based on that authority. Its provisions are subject to judicial review, available both to the State and to individuals if action of the Attorney General or any examiner is questioned. I believe the bill is constitutional.

This is a bill of the greatest importance, and one on which the Congress should act with urgency. No one can really make any argument against the right of any American citizen to vote. One of the most moving passages of the President's speech last Monday evening, was that which was concerned with the continued efforts of Negroes to secure their right to vote, as the evidence of their faith in the processes of our Government, in the processes of law; it was about their belief in the principles for which this country stands. As American citizens, they have faith in America, and we must sustain that faith. The time has come to act upon this bill—a bill to secure the right of every citizen of our country to vote.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], for their fine intercession.

My argument reminds me of the fact that many Senators who are concerned with the committee system now have an opportunity to prove it. Some Senators have objected when, as with the 1964 bill, we have placed a civil rights bill directly on the calendar when it came over from the House. This motion at least constitutes a good-faith effort to find the best compromise between that procedure and the feelings of certain Senators that committees should consider every measure. We are going to send this bill to a committee, but we are putting a tag on it as to when we wish it back. I believe that is an eminently reasonable proposal.

Finally, let us understand that whatever one may say about the individual merits of the bill—and I shall examine it, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, with the greatest of fidelity to my oath as a Senator, my conscience, and my training as a lawyer—on this question, which has now been sanctified in the blood of its martyrs, in which are involved the deep feeling of so many millions of American citizens, the least that Congress can do is to uphold the mandate of the President, and expedite action to the maximum extent possible consistent with our duty.

I hope that the committee will consider not only the voting question, but also the question of excessive police action, which has sought to substitute terror for law in order to inhibit Negroes from asserting their right to vote. I have introduced a bill with other Senators on that subject, S. 1497, which I hope will also be considered in committee.

To summarize, many citizens have been denied the right to vote for too long, and the figures show it. There has been ample opportunity for the States to show their responsibility by at least giving them the right to vote. In some States, of course, they have done so. This bill by no means sweeps across all the States of the old Confederacy. It affects only a number of them, on the basis of the facts we now have.

Thus, those who have been denied the right to vote, by the failure of the States to give it to them, now have the right to say: "How long, O Lord—how long?" It is our duty to answer: "Not 1 minute longer than is absolutely essential."

I compliment the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader for perceiving this urgency, and also for perceiving where our duty lies. We all know that it will not stop all demonstrations. We know, too, that with demonstrations we face the razor's edge. Will they be demonstrations which go over the edge and become revolutionary in character, because there is no honest effort to satisfy honest grievances, or will they be demonstrations which stay this side of the edge which we do not wish them to cross? It will depend upon our good faith in trying to satisfy the honest complaints of honest, God-fearing American citizens. That is what we are doing today. I congratulate the minority leader—and also the majority leader—on leading the Senate in doing so.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BASS. Does the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] wish recognition?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I felt that the vote might be held now, unless the Senator wishes to speak on the bill.

Mr. BASS. I am ready to vote now, but I understand that the Senator from Mississippi wishes to make a statement before the vote. I wish to make a short statement, and then I shall be ready for the vote.

Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement, but I will yield at this point for the vote, with the hope that I may be recognized to make a short statement immediately after the vote has been taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. METCALF (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at

liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Calfornia [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 13, as follows:

[No. 40 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Aiken	Fulbright	Morton
Allott	Gore	Mundt
Anderson	Harris	Muskie
Bartlett	Hart	Nelson
Bass	Hartke	Neuberger
Bayh	Hayden	Pastore
Bible	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Boggs	Hruska	Pell
Brewster	Inouye	Prouty
Burdick	Jackson	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Carlson	Kennedy, Mass.	Scott
Case	Kuchel	Simpson
Clark	Lausche	Symington
Cooper	Magnuson	Tydings
Cotton	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Curtis	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	McNamara	Yarborough
Dodd	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Douglas	Montoya	
Fong	Morse	

NAYS—13

Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Eastland	Long, La.	Talmadge
Hill	McClellan	Thurmond
Holland	Robertson	
Johnston	Smith	

NOT VOTING—20

Bennett	Long, Mo.	Murphy
Church	Mansfield	Russell
Ellender	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Ervin	McGee	Smathers
Fannin	Metcalf	Sparkman
Gruening	Monroney	Tower
Kennedy, N.Y.	Moss	

So the motion of Mr. MANSFIELD and other Senators to refer the bill (S. 1564) to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New York to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, on the motion to refer the bill to committee, I voted "nay." I do not believe that sufficient time has been allowed to permit this very important measure to receive the proper hearings it deserves. That was my reason for voting "nay."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965."

SEC. 2. No voting qualification or procedure shall be imposed or applied to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color.

SEC. 3. (a) No person shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device, in any State or in any political subdivision of a State which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device as a qualification for voting, and with respect to which (2) the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

(b) The phrase "test or device" shall mean any requirement that a person as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, (2) demonstrate any educational achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject, (3) possess good moral character, or (4) prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class.

(c) Any State with respect to which determinations have been made under subsection (a) or any political subdivision with respect to which such determinations have been made as a separate unit, may file in a three-judge district court convened in the District of Columbia an action for a declaratory judgment against the United States, alleging that neither the petitioner nor any person acting under color of law has engaged during the ten years preceding the filing of the action in acts or practices denying or abridging the right to vote for reasons of race or color. If the court determines that neither the petitioner nor any person acting under color of law has engaged during such period in any act or practice denying or abridging the right to vote for reasons of race or color, the court shall so declare and the provisions of subsection (a) and the examiner procedure established by this Act shall after judgment be inapplicable to the petitioner. Any appeal from a judgment of a three-judge court convened under this subsection shall lie to the Supreme Court.

No declaratory judgment shall issue under this subsection with respect to any petitioner for a period of ten years after the entry of a final judgment of any court of the United States, whether entered prior to or after the enactment of this Act, determining that denials or abridgments of the right to vote by reason of race or color have occurred anywhere in the territory of such petitioner.

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever the Attorney General certifies (1) that he has received complaints in writing from twenty or more residents of a political subdivision with respect to which determinations have been made under section 3(a) alleging that they have been denied the right to vote under color of law by reason of race or color, and that he believes such complaints to be meritorious, or (2) that in his judgment the appointment of examiners is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the Fifteenth Amendment, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint as many examiners in such subdivision as it may deem appropriate to prepare and maintain lists of persons eligible to vote in Federal, State, and local elections. Such appointments shall be made without regard to the Civil Service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and may be terminated by the Commission at any time. Examiners shall be subject to the provisions of Section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939, as amended (the Hatch Act). An examiner shall have the power to administer oaths.

(b) A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under section 3 or 4 shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

SEC. 5. (a) The examiners for each political subdivision shall examine applicants concerning their qualifications for voting. An application to an examiner shall be in such form as the Commission may require and shall contain allegations that the applicant is not otherwise registered to vote, and that, within ninety days preceding his application, he has been denied under color of law the opportunity to register or to vote or has been found not qualified to vote by a person acting under color of law: *Provided,* That the requirement of the latter allegation may be waived by the Attorney General.

(b) Any person whom the examiner finds to have the qualifications prescribed by State law in accordance with instructions received under section 6(b) shall promptly be placed on a list of eligible voters. A challenge to such listing may be made in accordance with section 6(a) and shall not be the basis for a prosecution under any provision of this Act. The list shall be available for public inspection and the examiner shall certify and transmit such list, and any supplements as appropriate, each month to the offices of the appropriate election officials, with copies to the Attorney General and the attorney general of the State. Any person whose name appears on such a list shall be entitled and allowed to vote in the election district of his residence unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list in accordance with subsection (d): *Provided,* That no person shall be entitled to vote in any election by virtue of this Act unless his name shall have been certified and transmitted on such a list

to the offices of the appropriate election officials at least 45 days prior to such election.

(c) The examiner shall issue to each person appearing on such a list a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote.

(d) A person whose name appears on such a list shall be removed therefrom by an examiner if (1) he has been successfully challenged in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 6(a), or (2) he has been determined by an examiner (i) not to have voted at least once during three consecutive years while listed, or (ii) to have otherwise lost his eligibility to vote.

(e) No person shall be denied the right to vote for failure to pay a poll tax if he tenders payment of such tax for the current year to an examiner, whether or not such tender would be timely or adequate under State law. An examiner shall have authority to accept such payment from any person authorized to make an application for listing, and shall issue a receipt for such payment. The examiner shall transmit promptly any such poll tax payment to the office of the State or local official authorized to receive such payment under State law, together with the name and address of the applicant.

SEC. 6. (a) Any challenge to a listing on an eligibility list shall be heard and determined by a hearing officer appointed by and responsible to the Civil Service Commission and under such rules as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe. Such challenge shall be entertained only if made within ten days after the challenged person is listed, and if supported by the affidavit of at least two persons having personal knowledge of the facts constituting grounds for the challenge, and such challenge shall be determined within seven days after it was made. A petition for review of the decision of the hearing officer may be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the person challenged resides within fifteen days after service of such decision by mail on the moving party, but no decision of a hearing officer shall be overturned unless clearly erroneous. Any person listed shall be entitled and allowed to vote pending final determination by the hearing officer and by the court.

(b) The times, places, and procedures for application and listing pursuant to this Act and removals from the eligibility lists shall be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission and the Commission shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, instruct examiners concerning the qualifications required for listing.

SEC. 7. No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall fail or refuse to permit a person whose name appears on a list transmitted in accordance with section 5(b) to vote, or fail or refuse to count such person's vote, or intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person for voting or attempting to vote under the authority of this Act.

SEC. 8. Whenever a State or political subdivision for which determinations are in effect under section 3(a) shall enact any law or ordinance imposing qualifications or procedures for voting different than those in force and effect on November 1, 1964, such law or ordinance shall not be enforced unless and until it shall have been finally adjudicated by an action for declaratory judgment brought against the United States in the district court for the District of Columbia that such qualifications or procedures will not have the effect of denying or abridging rights guaranteed by the fifteenth amendment. All actions hereunder shall be heard by a three-judge court and there shall be a right of direct appeal to the Supreme Court.

SEC. 9. (a) Whoever shall deprive or attempt to deprive any person of any right secured by section 2 or 3 or who shall violate section 7, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, within a year following an election in a political subdivision in which an examiner has been appointed (1) destroys, defaces, mutilates, or otherwise alters the marking of a paper ballot cast in such election, or (2) alters any record of voting in such election made by a voting machine or otherwise, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(c) Whoever conspires to violate the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or interferes with any right secured by section 2, 3, or 7, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(d) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 2, 3, 7 or 8 or subsection (b) of this section, the Attorney General may institute for the United States, or in the name of the United States, an action for preventive relief, including an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, and including an order directed to the State and State or local election officials to require them to honor listings under this Act.

(e) Whenever a person alleges to an examiner within 24 hours after the closing of the polls that notwithstanding his listing under this Act he has not been permitted to vote or that his vote was not counted, the examiner shall forthwith notify the United States Attorney for the judicial district if such allegation in his opinion appears to be well founded. Upon receipt of such notification, the United States Attorney may forthwith apply in the district court for an order enjoining certification of the results of the election, and the court shall issue such an order pending a hearing to determine whether the allegations are well founded. In the event the court determines that persons who are entitled to vote under the provisions of this Act were not permitted to vote or their votes were not counted, it shall provide for the casting or counting of their ballots and require the inclusion of their votes in the total vote before any person shall be deemed to be elected by virtue of any election with respect to which an order enjoining certification of the results has been issued.

(f) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether an applicant for listing under this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

SEC. 10. Listing procedures shall be terminated in any political subdivision of any State whenever the Attorney General notifies the Civil Service Commission (1) that all persons listed by the examiner for such subdivision have been placed on the appropriate voting registration roll, and (2) that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that persons will be deprived of or denied the right to vote on account of race or color in such subdivision.

SEC. 11. (a) All cases of civil and criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act shall be governed by section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1995).

(b) No court other than the district court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment or any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provision of this Act or any action of any federal officer or employee pursuant hereto.

(c) The term "vote" shall have the same meaning as in section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971(e)).

(d) Any statement made to an examiner may be the basis for a prosecution under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am proud to join with our distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, and others in cosponsoring the President's voting rights bill. The President's eloquent expression of the need for this measure on last Monday night needs no further embellishment. As he stated on that truly historic occasion, "Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote." About that, there can be no argument. The time for full enforcement of the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States is long overdue.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to express my firm hope that the passage of this bill into law will be swift and that after enactment its consequence will be justice at the polls for all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have always been in favor of guaranteeing to every American citizen the right to vote, but if we are going to pass a law authorizing the Federal Government to take charge of registration in the States in order to guarantee that right, let us also guarantee clean elections.

Under the bill proposed by the administration, it is suggested that the literacy tests for all States be reduced to a simple requirement that the voter be able to sign his own name and address and to give his period of residence in his district.

I suggested to the committee which was drafting this legislation that it be broad enough to include provisions:

First, to make it a Federal crime, subject to heavy penalties, for anyone to give false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in the voting district for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote.

Second. To make it a Federal crime for anyone to conspire with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration or illegal voting; and

Third. To make it a Federal crime for anyone to pay or offer to pay or for anyone to accept payment either for registration or for voting.

I regret that the administration did not see fit to include these safeguards in the original bill—therefore I am today introducing an amendment which reads as follows:

At the appropriate place add a new section as follows:

"Whoever gives false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in the voting district for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote, or conspires with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration or illegal voting, or pays or offers to pay or accepts payment either for registration or for voting shall be fined not more than $10,000

or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

I strongly support the principle that every American citizen should have the right to vote, but it is equally important that every American citizen be guaranteed that his vote will be counted in a clean election.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in 1959, early in my first term as U.S. Senator, I wrote in the newsletter which I send as an added service to my constituents:

This Congress should expand civil rights and protect civil liberties. We should support the Supreme Court of the United States and its decisions as the law of the land. Daily we hear and read arguments for and against segregation and suggestions to compromise troublesome questions of civil rights. There just cannot be any compromise on civil rights. Either you are for the Supreme Court decision or you are resisting law and order. Racial problems are, in reality, moral problems and not political issues. Let us remember at all times, we are the Nation which chiseled on our Statute of Liberty: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free; send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

At that time in all candor I must say I believed it would be a matter of some years before full civil rights and civil liberties would be won by Negroes in States in the Deep South. However, the brutal savagery of bigoted white people in Mississippi and Alabama, coupled with the intolerable, malicious, arrogant and cruel actions of State and local police have speeded the time by many years that complete civil rights will be granted and exercised by all citizens of those States and all States of the United States. The good that will come from this violence is that all citizens of those States, Negro and white alike, will be assured of their right to vote. The conscience of our Nation has been aroused. These vile extremists preaching hate and white supremacy and practicing brutality and utmost savagery have ruined their own objectives.

I am indeed proud to reaffirm my complete dedication to the principle of full civil rights and civil liberties for all citizens by cosponsoring the voting rights bill introduced in the Senate.

It is left for us now to guarantee the right to vote to all Americans. To temporize is to encourage defiance of the law and contempt for the law. We are a Nation committed to justice and to democratic principles; a government of law and not of men. We cannot continue to deny to millions of our citizens what we offer to the world.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the administration voting rights proposal will be enacted into law with dispatch. We must put past wrongs behind us and go forward in building the Great Society and toward fulfilling the promise of our heritage.

In his first inaugural address Thomas Jefferson said:

Equal and exact justice to all men * * * the wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment * * * and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads us to peace, liberty, and safety.

Let us heed his words and take this one step further toward the goal of equal and exact justice for all men. We must take this step and in doing so at last extend the assurances of our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence and our heritage of freedom to all Americans.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] as a delegate to a conference of the International Maritime Consultative Organization on Facilitation of Maritime Travel, in London, on March 24 through April 9.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Camden County Conservative Club, at Haddon Township, N.J., favoring the enactment of the Dirksen amendment to the Constitution relating to reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution of the Legislature of Montana.

This resolution calls upon the Congress for speedy enactment of an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act to abolish that provision of the act which permits enactment by the several States of the so-called right-to-work laws. It was passed overwhelmingly, 63 to 25 in the House and 43 to 6 by the Montana Senate.

The joint resolution also carries the signature of the Governor of Montana, Tim Babcock. This represents an abrupt turnabout in the position of the Governor on anticollective bargaining laws.

During the campaign of 1964, an active educational program was carried out in Montana pointing out the faults of this misnamed type of antiunion legislation. Since section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act became law, there have been efforts to enact a right-to-work law in Montana in varying degrees.

The present Governor was one of the Republican leaders in the State legislature who led a fight for a right-to-work law in 1956. The attempt failed. But 2 years later he led circulation of an initiative petition seeking to place the right-to-work proposal on the November 1958 ballot. This attempt also failed. The right-to-work forces were unable to obtain the 26,000 signatures that were necessary to place the issue on the ballot.

The right-to-work law proposal again was a major issue in Montana in last year's national presidential election. Babcock backed the candidacy of former Senator Barry Goldwater, also a right-to-work advocate. The Governor was instrumental in obtaining support of the Montana delegation for Goldwater at the Republican convention. He supported the Goldwater ticket unreservedly, but at the same time told the Montana AFL–CIO convention last August he "saw no present need for a right-to-work law in Montana."

As late as November 17, however, Babcock indicated he had not changed his position of support of Goldwater right-wing principles. Congressional Quarterly quotes Babcock as saying:

I feel we'll have to get together and have consultations with other Governors and party leaders. My enthusiasm has not been dampened by the election. It seemed the country was not quite ready for Goldwater. But I ran on the principles for which he stands and I was able to win.

Thus a Republican Governor who twice led unsuccessful fights for a so-called right-to-work law in Montana, who supported right-to-work advocate Barry Goldwater, now has called on the Congress to repeal the right-to-work section of Federal labor-management law.

Governor Babcock, under Montana law could not veto a memorial to Congress, but his signature was not needed—he was not required to sign. His action represents a startling reversal of his long-time record favoring such crippling legislation.

Most enlightened observers—and obviously Montanans are no exception—agree that the right-to-work experiment has turned out rather badly.

Last year the Democratic Party captured both houses of the State legislature while consistently opposing right-to-work proposals. Babcock narrowly won his bid for reelection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOUSE RESOLUTION 34

Joint resolution of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Montana calling for speedy enactment by the U.S. Congress, of an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act to abolish that provision of said act dealing with right-to-work laws

Whereas in his state of the Union address the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, has called upon Congress to repeal this portion of the Taft-Hartley Act which authorizes the establishment and enactment of right-to-work laws in the several States of this Union, and

Whereas it is favorable to the interest of all Montana that Congress speedily enact legislation in accordance with this special request of the President: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives and by the Senate of the State of Montana, That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana hereby strongly endorse the recommendation of the President of the United States to the Congress that that portion of the Taft-Hartley Act authorizing and enabling the several States to adopt the right-to-work laws be, by

the Congress of the United States of America, repealed; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Montana is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the Department of Justice of the United States, and to each member of the Montana congressional delegation.

RAY J. WAYRYNEN,
Speaker of the House.
TED JAMES,
President of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution which was passed by the General Assembly of the House of Representatives of the Pennsylvania Legislature, dealing with the subject of civil rights, together with an accompanying letter written to me by the chief clerk, Anthony J. Petrosky.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Harrisburg, Pa., March 15, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: Attached is a copy of House Resolution 37 which was adopted on March 9, 1965. I thought this would be of interest to you.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY J. PETROSKY,
The Chief Clerk.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 37

The fundamental right of citizens of the United States to vote cannot be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race or color.

In order to exercise this fundamental right to vote, a voter must be allowed to register.

This right has been denied in several States in the South and as a consequence, citizens therein have assembled peacefully to petition their elected officials for redress of their grievances; namely, for their rights to be registered as voters.

This right to register being denied, demonstrations have been held in various cities of the South and the latest of which was held in Selma, Ala., on Sunday, March 7, when a group of demonstrators endeavored to march to Montgomery, the capital of Alabama.

The police and others attacked the marchers and many of the demonstrators were beaten and injured.

It is because of the brutality of the police on this occasion that we, the members of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, vigorously protest: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives express its sympathy with these people who are endeavoring to secure for themselves and for others, their constitutional rights to register and vote; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. authorities take immediate action to protect these citizens in their remonstrances and to direct their efforts in bringing about the speedy registration of all persons who desire to register so they may exercise their fundamental right to vote; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each of the two Senators and to each of the Representatives from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

RESOLUTION TO ABOLISH DISCRIMINATORY CLAUSE OF THE NATIONAL ORIGIN QUOTA SYSTEM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation which would abolish the discriminatory clause of the national origin quota system in our immigration laws which was passed by the Council of the City of Philadelphia at a meeting held March 11, 1965.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY COUNCIL,
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
March 16, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: I am privileged to forward to you a certified copy of Resolution 104, entitled: "Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation currently before the Judiciary Committees of both National Chambers which would abolish the discriminatory clause of the national origin quota system."

This resolution was adopted unanimously by the Council of the City of Philadelphia at a meeting held March 11, 1965.

Sincerely,

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President, City Council.

RESOLUTION 104

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation currently before the Judiciary Committees of both National Chambers which would abolish the discriminatory clause of the national origin quota system.

Whereas the Walter-McCarran Act of 1952 terminated racial bars on immigration, but continued the quota system based on national origin; and

Whereas such provisions thereby continue ethnic discrimination which should have no place in American life; and

Whereas as a result of arbitrary national quotas, many persons seeking a home here are denied while other national quotas go unfilled: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation currently before the Judiciary Committees of both National Chambers which would abolish the discriminatory clause of the national quota system.

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to members of the Judiciary Committees of both National Chambers, to members of the Philadelphia congressional delegation and to our two U.S. Senators.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest:

NATHAN WOLFMAN,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

ATTENDANCE AT MEETING OF THE COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 125)

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 89) authorizing attendance at the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Wellington, New Zealand, and submitted a report thereon; which report was ordered to be printed, and the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate is authorized to appoint four Members of the Senate as a delegation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Wellington, New Zealand, at the invitation of the New Zealand branch of the Association, and to designate the chairman of said delegation.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the delegation, including staff members designated by the chairman to assist said delegation, shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

PLACING OF MINOR CHILDREN FOR PERMANENT FREE CARE OR FOR ADOPTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE — ADDITIONAL VIEWS (REPT. NO. 126)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to submit a report to accompany S. 624, to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption, together with the additional views of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

I ask unanimous consent that the report together with the additional views be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS CONCERNING THE 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 the report of the Committee on Appropriations concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by the committee in 1964 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 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
Senator Gordon Allott:											
Holland	Dutch guilder					4,207.011	1,165.70			4,207.011	1,165.70
Finland	Markka	258.39	80.55	14.00	4.36			39.71	12.35	312.10	97.26
Switzerland	Swiss franc	67.60	16.09	7.75	1.85	24.80	5.90	4.00	.96	104.15	24.80
Subtotal			96.64		6.21		1,171.60		13.31		1,287.76
Senator E. L. Bartlett:											
England	Pound	2-14-4	7.59							2-14-4	7.59
Do	Dollar		10.00								10.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	121.66	30.63	130	32.68			37.84	9.56	289.5	72.87
Austria	Schilling	750	30.10	800	32.10			424	14.52	1,974	76.72
Do	Dollar						891.90				891.90
Subtotal			78.32		64.78		891.90		24.08		1,059.08
Senator Robert C. Byrd:											
France	Franc	431.20	88.00	165.62	33.80	17.15	3.50	45.42	9.27	659.39	134.57
Israel	Dinar	99.00	33.00	106.68	35.56	24.00	8.00	75.00	25.00	304.68	101.56
Italy	Lira	925.00	148.00	30,550	48.88	6,006	9.61	10,256	16.41	139,312	222.90
Jordan	Dinar	26.79	75.00	5.83	16.33			3.10	8.67	35.72	100.00
Turkey	Lira	756.00	84.00	54.00	6.00			90.00	10.00	900.00	100.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc	776.88	180.00	349.60	81.00	288.70	66.89	86.32	20.00	1,501.50	347.89
United Arab Republic	Pound	26.03	60.00	28.10	64.77	3.47	8.00	7.38	17.00	64,985	149.77
Transportation, round trip	Guilder						829.75				829.75
Subtotal			668.00		286.34		925.75		106.35		1,986.44
Senator Norris Cotton:											
France	Franc	120	24.30	100	20.25	80	16.20	20	4.05	320	64.80
England	Pound	14-6-0	39.84	12-0-7	33.50	4-0-0	11.12	2-5-0	6.26	32-11-7	90.72
Subtotal			64.14		53.75		27.32		10.31		155.52
Senator Allen J. Ellender:											
Lebanon	Pound									256.50	83.88
France	Franc									475.00	96.90
Netherlands	Guilder					5,432.049	1,472.10			5,432.049	1,472.10
Subtotal							1,472.10				1,652.88
Senator Roman L. Hruska:											
Germany	Deutsche mark					3,440.689	865.80			3,440.689	865.80
United Arab Republic	Egyptian pound.	56.00	129.06	46.00	106.02	44.40	102.33	5.00	11.52	151.40	348.93
Lebanon	Lebanese pound.	373.60	122.17	315.90	103.30			42.0	13.74	731.50	239.21
Jordan	Dinar	7.655	21.42	6.790	18.98	1.500	4.19	1.224	3.42	17.169	48.01
Turkey	Lira	345	38.33	480	53.33	75	8.34			900	100.00
Greece	Drachma	1,366	45.53	1,634	54.47	1,012	33.73			4,012	133.73
Italy	Lira	45,425	72.68	37,800	60.48	9,465	15.14	1,060	1.70	93,750	150.00
Spain	Peseta	4,080	68.00	12,840	214.00	4,200	70.00	1,200	20.00	22,320	372.00
Subtotal			497.19		610.58		1,099.53		50.38		2,257.68
Senator Thomas H. Kuchel:											
England	Pound	17-7-8	48.74	5-8-4	15.00	2-8-4	6.55	3-15-2	10.40	28-19-6	80.69
Do	Dollar		42.02		57.27		8.18		26.27		133.74
Portugal	Escudo	1,432.00	49.75	1,019.00	35.40			176.00	6.10	8,748.00	91.25
Do	Dollar		51.50		27.20		4.00		10.77		93.47
Germany	Deutsche mark	133.48	33.60	66.52	16.73					200	50.33
Do	Dollar		30.15		39.19		5.00		22.52		96.86
Subtotal			255.76		190.79		23.73		76.06		546.34
Senator A. S. Mike Monroney:											
Japan	Yen	56,977	158.27	720	2.00	11,916	33.10	20,386	56.63	90,000	250.00
Vietnam	Piaster							3,038	41.74	3,038	41.74
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	446.53	76.70	314.50	54.72			394.16	68.58	1,149.50	200.00
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	472.40	11.81					200	5.00	672.40	16.81
Okinawa	U.S. dollar								5.00		5.00
Korea	Won							4,326.50	17.00	4,326.50	17.00
Round trip airfare	U.S. dollar						1,719.30				1,719.30
Subtotal			246.78		56.72		1,752.40		193.95		2,249.85
Senator Milton R. Young:											
Austria	Schilling	450.00	17.48	350.00	13.60	327.00	12.74	200.00	7.77	1,327.00	51.59
Do	U.S. dollar				18.62				15.24		33.86
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	452.03	78.48	351.57	61.04			500.90	34.88	1,004.50	174.40
Do	U.S. dollar				24.82				20.32		45.14
Italy	Lira	39,600.00	63.36	30,800.00	49.28			17,600.00	28.16	88,000.00	140.80
Do	U.S. dollar				24.82				20.32		45.14
Japan	Yen	25,650.00	71.24	19,950.00	55.42			11,400.00	31.67	57,000.00	158.33
Do	U.S. dollar				24.82				20.32		45.14
Spain	Peseta	1,858.73	31.04	1,445.68	24.13			826.10	13.79	4,130.50	68.96
Do	U.S. dollar				18.62				15.24		33.86
Taiwan	Taiwan dollar	573.07	14.33	445.73	11.14			254.70	6.37	1,273.50	31.48
Do	U.S. dollar				6.20				5.09		11.29
Thailand	Baht	788.85	38.20	613.55	29.71			350.60	16.98	1,753.00	84.89
Do	U.S. dollar				12.41				10.16		22.57
Turkey	Lira	139.50	15.50	108.50	12.05			62.00	6.89	310.00	34.44
Do	U.S. dollar				6.20				5.09		11.29
Vietnam	Piaster										
Do	U.S. dollar										
Okinawa	do				10.34				8.46		18.80
India	Rupee			129.92	27.24	8,974.45	1,877.50	55.68	11.68	9,160.05	1,916.42
Do	U.S. dollar				18.61				15.24		33.85
Hungary	Forint	465.00	9.68	361.67	7.53			206.67	4.31	1,033.33	21.52
Do	U.S. dollar										

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

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
Senator Milton R. Young—Continued											
United Arab Republic	Pound	31.86	73.44	10.63	24.48	14.16	32.64	14.16	32.64	70.81	163.20
Do	U.S. dollar				22.75				18.63		41.38
Israel	Pound	62.43	20.81	48.55	16.18			27.74	9.25	138.72	46.24
Do	U.S. dollar				12.41				10.16		22.57
Jordan	Dinar	7.375	20.63	5.737	16.05			3.278	9.17	16.390	45.85
Do	U.S. dollar				6.20				5.09		11.29
Subtotal			454.19		554.67		1,922.88		382.92		3,314.66
Kenneth J. Bousquet:											
Austria	Schilling	520.78	20.24	405.06	15.74	328.00	12.74	231.46	8.99	1,485.30	57.71
Do	U.S. dollar				6.20				5.00		11.20
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	583.60	101.32	453.91	78.80			259.37	45.03	1,296.88	225.15
Do	U.S. dollar				31.50				25.30		56.80
Hungary	Forint	465.00	9.69	361.67	7.54			206.67	4.30	1,033.34	21.53
Do	U.S. dollar				6.00				5.10		11.10
India	Rupee	78.61	16.49	61.13	12.82	9,580.08	2,004.20	34.93	7.33	9,754.75	2,040.84
Do	U.S. dollar				25.30				20.25		45.55
Italy	Lira	38,002.5	60.80	29,557.5	47.30	12,050	19.28	16,890	27.02	96.500	154.40
Do	U.S. dollar				25.10				20.15		45.25
Japan	Yen	27,450	76.25	21,350	59.30			12,200	33.89	61,000	169.44
Do	U.S. dollar				25.15				20.30		45.45
Jordan	Dinar	6.488	18.12	5.038	14.08			2.869	8.05	14.395	40.25
Do	U.S. dollar				6.20				4.80		11.00
Spain	Peseta	1,751.17	29.24	1,362.03	22.74			778.30	13.00	3,891.50	64.98
Do	U.S. dollar				12.30				10.15		22.45
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar	573.07	14.33	445.73	11.15			254.70	6.36	1,273.50	31.84
Do	U.S. dollar				12.50				10.05		22.55
Thailand	Baht	654.75	31.71	509.25	24.66			291.00	14.09	1,455	70.46
Do	U.S. dollar				12.45				10.15		22.60
Turkey	Turkish lira	157.50	17.50	122.50	13.62			70.00	7.78	350	38.90
Do	U.S. dollar				5.80				4.85		10.65
Egypt	Pound	23.62	54.43	18.37	42.34	14.16	32.64	10.50	24.19	66.65	153.60
Do	U.S. dollar				25.00				20.10		45.10
Israel	Pound	58.75	19.59	45.70	15.23			26.11	8.70	130.56	43.52
Do	U.S. dollar				6.30				5.15		11.45
Okinawa	do		1.00		7.10				6.92		15.02
Subtotal			470.71		572.22		2,068.86		377.00		3,488.79
Patricia Byrne:											
Austria	Schilling	231.75	9.00	180.25	7.00	328.00	12.74	103.00	4.01	843.00	32.75
Do	U.S. dollar				18.62				15.24		33.86
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	504.85	87.63	392.66	68.16			224.37	38.95	1,121.88	194.74
Do	U.S. dollar				24.82				20.32		45.14
Italy	Lira	16,335.00	26.14	12,705.00	20.32			7,260.00	11.62	36,300.00	58.08
Do	U.S. dollar				24.82				20.32		45.14
Japan	Yen	24,300.00	67.50	18,900.00	52.50			10,800.00	30.00	54,000.00	150.00
Do	U.S. dollar				24.82				20.32		45.14
Spain	Peseta	1,377.68	23.00	1,071.52	17.90			612.30	10.22	3,061.50	51.12
Do	U.S. dollar				18.62				15.24		33.86
Taiwan	Taiwan dollar	573.07	14.33	445.73	11.14			254.70	6.37	1,273.50	31.84
Do	U.S. dollar				6.20				5.09		11.29
Thailand	Baht	847.35	41.04	659.05	31.92			376.60	18.24	1,883.00	91.20
Do	U.S. dollar				12.41				10.16		22.57
Turkey	Lira	135.00	15.00	105.00	11.67			60.00	6.66	300.00	33.33
Do	U.S. dollar				6.20				5.09		11.29
Okinawa	do				10.34				8.46		18.80
India	Rupee			129.92	27.24	9,580.76	2,004.20	55.68	11.68	9,766.36	2,043.12
Do	U.S. dollar				18.61				15.24		33.85
Hungary	Forint	465.00	9.68	361.67	7.53			206.67	4.31	1,033.33	21.52
Do	U.S. dollar										
Jordan	Dinar	7.022	19.63	5.462	15.27			3.121	8.73	15.605	43.63
Do	U.S. dollar				6.20				5.09		11.29
United Arab Republic	Pound	31.86	73.44	10.63	24.48	14.16	32.64	14.16	32.64	70.81	163.20
Do	U.S. dollar				22.75				18.63		41.38
Israel	Pound	62.43	20.81	48.55	16.18			27.74	9.25	138.72	46.24
Do	U.S. dollar				12.41				10.16		22.57
Subtotal			407.20		518.13		2,049.58		362.04		3,336.95
Paul J. Cotter:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	357,509	219.00	190,280	117.00	17,838	11.00	29,732	18.00	595,358	365.00
Venezuela	U.S. dollar		32.00		12.00				2.00		46.00
Pan Am fare: United States to Brazil and return via Caracas, Venezuela.	Cruzeiro					1,448,418	888.60			1,448,418	888.60
Subtotal			251.00		129.00		899.60		20.00		1,299.60
Herman E. Downey:											
London	Pound	21-0-6	117.72	8-4-0	120.26		35.00			294.6	272.98
Holland	Dollar		51.75		97.50		33.50				182.75
Israel	Pound	273.19	110.00	180.36	77.90		30.00			453.55	217.90
Air transportation from Washington, D.C.	Dollar						1,325.70				1,325.70
Subtotal			279.47		295.66		1,424.20				1,999.33
Benjamin F. Early:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	357,509	219.00	190,280	117.00	17,838	11.00	29,732	18.00	595,358	365.00
Venezuela	U.S. dollar		32.00		12.00				2.00		46.00
Pan Am fare: United States to Brazil and return via Caracas, Venezuela.	Cruzeiro					1,448,418	888.60			1,448,418	888.60
Subtotal			251.00		129.00		899.60		20.00		1,299.60

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

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
Paul R. Eaton:											
Spain	Peseta	1,426.72	23.82	1,109.68	18.53			634.10	10.59	3,170.50	52.94
Do	U.S. dollar		18.99		16.26						35.25
Italy	Lira	29,624	47.39	23,040	36.87			13,166	21.07	65,830	105.33
Do	U.S. dollar		19.79		15.46						35.25
Austria	Schilling	900.86	35.00	700.66	27.22			400.38	15.56	2,001.90	77.78
Do	U.S. dollar		19.39		15.86						35.25
Turkey	Lira	153.00	17.00	119.00	13.22			68.00	7.56	340.00	37.78
Do	U.S. dollar		6.46		5.29						11.75
Egypt	Pound	23.62	54.43	18.37	42.34	14.16	32.64	10.50	24.19	66.65	153.60
Do	U.S. dollar		25.85		21.15						47.00
Israel	Pound	58.75	21.38	45.69	16.64			26.12	9.50	130.56	47.52
Do	U.S. dollar		5.96		5.79						11.75
Jordan	Dinar	5.166	14.45	40.18	11.24			2.296	6.42	11.480	32.11
Do	U.S. dollar		6.96		4.79						11.75
India	Rupee	78.60	16.49	61.13	12.83	9,580.076	2,004.20	34.94	7.33	9,754.746	2,040.85
Do	U.S. dollar		20.39		14.86						35.25
Thailand	Baht	737.55	35.72	573.65	27.78			327.80	15.87	1,639.00	79.37
Do	U.S. dollar		12.93		10.57						23.50
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	445.16	77.29	508.75	88.32	63.59	11.04	254.38	44.16	1,271.88	220.81
Do	U.S. dollar		32.31		26.44						58.75
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	573.07	14.33	445.73	11.14			254.70	6.37	1,273.50	31.84
Do	U.S. dollar		6.71		5.04						11.75
Okinawa	do		6.30		5.62						11.92
Japan	Yen	27,040	75.57	21,032	58.78			12,018	33.59	60,090	167.94
Do	U.S. dollar		24.85		22.15						47.00
Subtotal			639.76		534.19		2,047.88		202.21		3,424.04
Joe Gonzales:											
England	Pound	6-5-0	17.50	3-8-4	9.54					9-13-4	27.04
Germany	Deutsche mark	121.66	30.63	130	32.67			37.84	9.56	289.5	72.86
Austria	Schilling	750	30.10	800	32.10			424	14.52	1,974	76.72
Do	Dollar						891.90				891.90
Mexico	Peso			250	20.00	87.50	7.00	62.50	4.10	400	31.10
Subtotal			78.23		94.31		898.90		28.18		1,099.62
William J. Kennedy:											
Rome, Italy	Lira	20,000	32.36	23,000	37.21	4,000	6.47	3,400	5.50	50,400	81.54
Naples, Italy	do	25,000	40.36	27,000	43.69	6,000	9.71	5,000	8.70	63,000	102.46
Geneva, Switzerland	Swiss franc	190	44.18	200	46.51	240	55.81	122	28.37	752	174.87
Beirut, Lebanon	Lebanese pound	165	55.40	140	46.60	20	10.76	110	36.51	428	148.87
Athens, Greece	Drachma	1,170	39.00	2,010	67.00	510	17.00	360	12.00	4,050	135.00
Transportation: District of Columbia to New York, Beirut, and return.	French Franc					6,406.12	1,304.26			6,406.12	1,304.26
Subtotal			210.90		241.01		1,404.01		91.80		1,947.00
Edmund T. King:											
Germany	Mark					4,406.76	1,108.90			4,406.76	1,108.90
Egypt	Pound	35.95	82.85	28.50	65.68	32.05	73.87	4.20	9.68	100.70	232.08
Syria	do	29.50	7.51			15.50	3.94			45.00	11.45
Jordan	Dinar	4.135	11.58	5.234	14.66	7.800	21.84			17.169	48.08
Lebanon	Pound	252.75	81.83	292.25	96.42	7.75	2.50	43.75	14.32	596.50	195.07
Turkey	Lira	345	38.33	405	45.00	150	16.67			900	100.00
Greece	Drachma	944	31.47	1,806	60.20					2,750	91.67
Italy	Lira	43,849	70.16	53,715	85.91	8,400	13.44	9,530	15.24	115,494	184.75
Subtotal			323.73		367.87		1,241.16		39.24		1,972.00
James Minotto:											
Jamaica	U.S. dollar		60.00		44.50		3.00		11.20		118.70
Dominican Republic	do		15.00		14.50		1.50		6.00		37.00
Puerto Rico	do		21.00		9.50		8.50		4.50		43.50
Martinique	do		43.00		26.50		2.50		9.80		81.80
Trinidad and Tobago	do		61.20		46.40		3.00		12.90		123.50
Venezuela	do		84.00		54.50		2.50		62.50		203.50
Panama	do		62.00		66.75		4.00		24.50		157.25
Costa Rica	do		31.00		24.00		1.00		6.00		62.00
Guatemala	do		64.00		62.50		5.00		22.00		153.50
Mexico	do		30.00		41.50		8.50		6.50		86.50
Brazil	Cruzeiro	327,600	287.40	336,300	295.00	34,200	30.00	45,300	39.82	775,000	652.22
Uruguay	Peso	1,234.80	63.00	1,195.60	61.00	256	12.28	313.60	16.00	3,000	152.28
Argentina	do	21,021	154.00	22,659	166.00	1,638	12.00	3,820	34.64	49,140	366.64
Chile	do	211.20	66.00	172.80	54.00			52.60	16.13	436.60	136.13
Peru	Sol	2,492.40	93.00	1,983.20	74.00	402.00	15.00	482.40	18.00	5,360.00	200.00
Mexico	Peso	1,473.82	118.00	2,223.22	178.00	124.90	10.00	299.76	24.00	4,121.70	330.00
Transportation	Dutch guilder					7,650.84	2,125.41			7,650.84	2,125.41
Subtotal			1,252.60		1,218.65		2,244.19		314.49		5,029.93
Robert S. Moore:											
Spain	Peseta	2,941.00	49.11	1,220	20.38			1,219	20.36	5,380	89.85
Italy	Lira	36,280	58.05	15,720	25.15			13,000	20.80	65,000	104.00
Austria	Shilling	870.60	34.82	920	36.80			659.40	26.38	2,450	98.00
Turkey	Lira	170	18.89	109	12.11			121	13.44	400	44.44
Jordan	Fil	5,170	14.48	2,830	7.92			3,085	8.64	11,085	31.04
Thailand	Baht	592.90	28.70	500	24.20			432.10	20.91	1,525	73.81
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	431.85	75.79	250	43.88			200.96	35.27	882.81	154.94
Formosa	Yuan	748.80	18.72	400	10.00			376.20	9.41	1,525	38.13
Japan	Yen	21,600	60.05	15,800	43.92			13,930	38.73	51,330	142.70
India	Rupee			129.92	27.24	9,580.76	2,004.20	55.68	11.68		2,043.12
Israel	Pound	62.43	20.81	48.55	16.18			27.74	9.25	138.72	46.24
United Arab Republic	do	31.86	73.44	1,063	24.48	14.16	32.64	14.16	32.64	70.81	163.20
Subtotal			452.86		292.26		2,036.84		247.51		3,029.47

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

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
William I. Palmer:											
Japan	Yen	19,008.00	52.80	15,312.00	42.54	3,000.00	8.33	3,000.00	8.33	40,320.00	112.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	290.00	50.35	118.00	20.49	25.00	4.34	67.00	11.63	500.00	86.81
Thailand	Baht	2,673.00	129.53	990.00	47.94	350.00	16.93	1,149.50	55.60	5,162.50	250.00
Lebanon	Lebanon pound	178.00	58.21	146.00	47.74	138.00	45.13	70.00	22.89	532.00	173.97
West Germany	Mark	269.60	67.80	156.80	39.45	208.00	52.33	150.00	37.74	784.40	197.32
England	Pound	24-2-0	67.48	15-4-6	42.63	8-3-0	2,282	8-5-0	23.10	55-14-6	156.03
Holland	Guilder					7,448.01	2,063.73			7,448.01	2,063.73
Subtotal			426.17		240.79		221,361		159.29		3,039.86
John E. Reilly:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	100,000	87.80	25,000	8.78			10,000	22.02	135,000	118.60
Chile	Escudo	400.00	125.00	200.00	62.50			110.00	34.38	710.00	221.88
Holland	Guilder					2,652.46	735.16			2,652.46	735.16
Venezuela	U.S. dollar		100.00		60.00				20.00		180.00
Subtotal			312.80		131.28		735.16		76.40		1,255.64
Raymond L. Schafer:											
Japan	Yen	27,990	77.75	21,510	59.75	653,904	1,816.40	3,780	10.50	707,184	1,964.40
Hong Kong, British Crown Colony	Hong Kong dollar.	306.59	53.60	193.91	33.90	100.10	17.50	114.40	20.00	715.00	125.00
Subtotal			131.35		93.65		1,833.90		30.50		2,089.40
Raymond L. Schafer:											
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,482.672	1,128.00			4,482.672	1,128.00
United Arab Republic	Egyptian pound.	35.95	82.85	29.08	67.02	27.70	63.84	6.50	14.98	99.23	228.69
Lebanon	Lebanon pound	291.50	95.32	324.0	105.95	28.0	9.14	34.0	11.10	677.50	221.51
Syria	Syrian pound	29.50	7.51			15.50	3.94			45.00	11.45
Jordan	Dinar	7.335	20.53	6.025	16.84	2.000	5.59	1.809	5.05	17.169	48.01
Turkey	Lira	345	38.33	355	39.45	200	22.22			900	100.00
Greece	Drachma	944	31.47	1,547	51.56	300	10.00			2,791.00	93.03
Italy	Lira	55,800	89.28	77,450	123.92	21,875	35.00	5,625	9.00	160,750	257.20
Subtotal			365.29		404.74		1,277.73		40.13		2,087.89
J. Mark Trice:											
England	Pound	9.12	26.88	5.7.2	15.12			3.0	8.40	17.19.2	50.40
France	Franc					280.10	60.23			280.10	60.23
Subtotal			26.88		15.12		60.23		8.40		110.63
Mary L. Vaughan:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	357,509	219.00	190,280	117.00	17,838	11.00	29,732	18.00	595,358	365.00
Venezuela	U.S. dollar		32.00		12.00				2.00		46.00
Pan American fare, United States to Brazil and return, via Caracas, Venezuela.	Cruzeiro					1,448,418	888.60			1,448,418	888.60
Subtotal			251.00		129.00		899.60		20.00		1,299.60
William W. Woodruff:											
Austria	Schilling	939.60	36.50	730.80	28.39			417.60	16.23	2,088.00	81.12
Do	U.S. dollar				18.62				15.24		33.86
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	468.00	81.12	364.00	63.16			207.70	36.19	1,039.50	180.47
Do	U.S. dollar				24.82				20.32		45.14
Italy	Lira	32,872.50	52.60	25,567.50	40.91			14,610.00	23.38	73,050.00	116.89
Do	U.S. dollar				24.82				20.32		45.14
Japan	Yen	27,000.00	75.00	21,000.00	58.33			12,000.00	33.34	60,000.00	166.67
Do	U.S. dollar				24.82				20.32		45.14
Spain	Peseta	2,092.73	34.94	1,627.68	27.18			930.10	15.53	4,650.50	77.65
Do	U.S. dollar				18.62				15.24		33.86
Taiwan	Taiwan dollar	573.08	14.33	445.72	11.14			254.70	6.37	1,273.50	31.84
Do	U.S. dollar				6.20				5.09		11.29
Thailand	Baht	864.90	41.89	672.70	32.58			384.40	18.61	1,922.00	93.08
Do	U.S. dollar				12.41				10.16		22.57
Turkey	Lira	180.45	20.05	140.35	15.60			80.20	8.91	401.00	44.56
Do	U.S. dollar				6.20				5.09		11.29
Vietnam	Piaster							298	4.09	298.00	4.09
Do	U.S. dollar										
Okinawa	do				10.34				8.46		18.80
India	Rupee			129.92	27.24	8,974.45	1,877.50	55.68	11.68	9,160.05	1,916.42
Do	U.S. dollar				18.61				15.24		33.85
Israel	Pound	62.43	20.81	48.55	16.18			27.74	9.25	138.72	46.24
Do	U.S. dollar				12.41				10.16		22.57
United Arab Republic	Pound	31.86	73.44	10.63	24.48	14.16	32.64	14.16	32.64	70.81	163.20
Do	U.S. dollar				22.75				18.63		41.38
Jordan	Dinar	7.551	21.12	5.873	16.42			3.356	9.38	16.780	46.92
Do	U.S. dollar				6.20				5.09		11.29
Subtotal			471.80		568.43		1,910.14		394.96		3,345.33

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$46,789.61
Appropriated funds:	
State Department	$1,385.25
Defense Department	3,929.25
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1,766.98
Post Office Department	1,793.80
Total	55,664.99

March 17, 1965.

Carl Hayden,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Senators DIRKSEN, KUCHEL, AIKEN, ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BASS, BAYH, BENNETT, BOGGS, BREWSTER, BURDICK, CASE, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, COTTON, DODD, DOMINICK, DOUGLAS, FONG, GRUENING, HARRIS, HART, HARTKE, INOUYE, JACKSON, JAVITS, JORDAN of Idaho, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, LAUSCHE, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MCINTYRE, MCNAMARA, METCALF, MONDALE, MONRONEY, MONTOYA, MORSE, MORTON, MOSS, MUNDT, MURPHY, MUSKIE, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PEARSON, PELL, PROUTY, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SYMINGTON, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YOUNG of Ohio, and YARBOROUGH):

S. 1564. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(See the remarks relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1565. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property situated in the State of Hawaii to the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1566. A bill to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1567. A bill to amend section 1331(c) of title 10, United States Code, relating to requirements for entitlement to retired pay for nonregular service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1568. A bill for the relief of Isadore Rainess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1569. A bill establishing the rate of compensation payable to certain employees of the United States for performing inspection or quarantine services on a Sunday or holiday; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1570. A bill to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 1571. A bill for the relief of Kermit Wager, of Lebanon, S. Dak.; and

S. 1572. A bill for the relief of Merritt A. Seefeldt and August C. Seefeldt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary L. McNamara; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 1574. A bill for the relief of Saeko Kono Matsuura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1575. A bill to establish a self-supporting Federal reinsurance program to protect employees in the enjoyment of certain rights under private pension plans; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 1576. A bill to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1577. A bill to authorize assistance under title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 for the development for open-space uses of land acquired under such title; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

RESOLUTION

ATTENDANCE AT MEETING OF THE COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 89) authorizing attendance at next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Wellington, New Zealand, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

PAY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES PERFORMING INSPECTION OR QUARANTINE SERVICES ON A SUNDAY OR HOLIDAY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish the rate of compensation payable to certain employees of the United States for performing inspection or quarantine services on a Sunday or holiday.

My bill would amend the act entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work," approved August 28, 1950, 65 Stat. 561.

That act does authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay added compensation for overtime night and holiday work for inspection or quarantine services relating to imports into and exports from the United States.

My bill, if enacted, would provide additional authority to the Secretary which would put plant inspection and quarantine personnel on a par with Federal employees in customs and immigration who are assigned to work on Sundays or holidays.

My bill will correct an inequality among Federal employees as those working in customs and immigration are paid overtime for duty on weekends or holidays, while USDA plant inspectors receive no additional compensation for similar assignment.

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

The bill (S. 1569) establishing the rate of compensation payable to certain employees of the United States for performing inspection or quarantine services on a Sunday or holiday, introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REINSURANCE OF PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on August 3 of last year I introduced a bill calling for public reinsurance of private pension plans, S. 3071. Today, with some changes which are for the most part relatively minor, I introduce such a bill again.

In presenting the bill last year, I noted that "there are a number of questions concerning the operation of private pension funds, questions which are being explored by the President's Labor-Management Committee." In January the report to which I referred was issued. Entitled "Public Policy and Private Pension Programs," and subtitled "A Report to the President on Private Employee Retirement Plans," the study is the successor to a provisional report issued in November 1962. Members of the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds and Other Private Retirement and Welfare Programs, who took notice of this kind of proposal, include Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz as Chairman; Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze; and others of similar high distinction.

Under the general heading, "Insurance," there may be found on pages 57 and 58 of the report these words:

> Another complex problem affecting the long-range value of the private pension system concerns the status of pension plan benefits in the event of a plan's termination. At present, employers do not ordinarily assume any liability beyond their contributions to the plan. If a plan is terminated for any reason (bankruptcy, closing a section of business, merger, etc.), the employer has no further obligation to contribute to the fund. Another proposal to meet this question is a system of insurance which, in the event of certain types of termination, would assure plan participants credit for accrued benefits. Under such a proposal, participating plans would pay a specific premium to an inspiring agency which would then pay any deficit in pension liabilities should the plan be terminated.

The Committee then goes on to note that such a proposal, which is embodied in my bill, "raises a number of difficult questions." Among them it lists:

> Is the possibility of a plan's termination an insurable risk? What types of termination (bankruptcy, merger, etc.) could be included? Is experience available on which to set a premium? How would such an insurance arrangement be administered?

The Committee concludes that it "is not in a position to answer these questions or to make any judgment regarding this proposal," and then adds a sentence with which I completely concur—"It does feel, however, that this matter is worthy of serious study."

I do not claim that the bill I present is the one and only ultimate answer to

the need. But it is at least an effort to devise a means to prevent the kind of situation which too often occurs with the departure of a defunct business which leaves employees without recourse, unable to receive the private pensions upon which they had counted as they worked over the years. This happened in South Bend, Ind., when Studebaker workers with 25 and 30 years of service who had not yet reached the age of 60 received none of the anticipated pension benefits which doubtless would have been theirs upon retirement had the company remained in business there. It has happened in other instances.

Basically, the bill sets up a nine-member Federal Advisory Council for Insurance of Employees' Pension Funds, working with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the members subject to Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation. Private pension plans would be required to participate, with the payment of premiums fixed by the Council, in order to qualify for the special tax treatment provided under the Internal Revenue Code. It would be self-financing and would not require the expenditure of public funds. Through this mechanism, protection would be given to a worker such as is now provided for his savings protection by insurance through a Government corporation such as the FDIC.

The bill does not assume protection to all persons covered by private pension plans. If the premium should prove to be insufficient, there is an established series of priorities, first of which is those who have already retired and who are receiving a pension, and those who have attained normal retirement age. Second priority would go to those who have attained age 60 or early retirement age, while those in younger age groups comprise the remaining categories. Payments would be made only when the normal retirement age is reached, however. Methods of increasing the possible protection in these lower priority groups should be explored, although details are not present in the bill.

Nor does the bill protect against all contingencies to which pension plans may be subject during their life. Because of business declines or the contraction of the work force, the continued payment of required contributions to maintain the plan may prove burdensome. Methods of assuming relief to the employer in these and other similar situations should be explored by the committee in considering this bill.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask that the explanation which I present may be printed at the close of these remarks, together with the text of the bill. I ask unanimous consent also that the bill may lie on the table until the close of business Friday, March 26, in order that those who wish to become cosponsors may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1575) to establish a self-supporting Federal reinsurance program to protect employees in the enjoyment of certain rights under private pension plans, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1575

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 "Federal Reinsurance of Private Pension Plans Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "pension fund" means a trust, pension plan, or other program under which an employer undertakes to provide, or assist in providing, retirement benefits for the exclusive benefit of his employees or their beneficiaries. Such term does not include any plan or program established by a self-employed individual for his own benefit or for the benefit of his survivors or established by one or more owner-employees exclusively for his or their benefit, or for the benefit of his or their survivors.

(b) The term "eligible pension fund" means a pension fund which meets the requirements set forth in section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to qualified pension plans.

(c)(1) The term "insured pension fund" means an eligible pension fund which has been in operation for not less than three years and, for each of such years, has met the requirements set forth in subsection (b) and has been insured under the program established under this Act.

(2) Any addition to, or amendment of, an insured pension fund shall, if such addition or amendment involves a significant increase (as determined by the Secretary) in the unfunded liability of such pension fund, be regarded as a new and distinct pension fund which can become an "insured pension fund" only upon compliance with the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 3. There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a program to be known as the Federal insurance program for private pension plans (hereinafter referred to as the "program"). The program shall be administered by, or under the direction and control of, the Secretary.

CONTINGENCIES INSURED AGAINST UNDER PROGRAM

SEC. 4. (a) The program shall insure (to the extent provided in subsection (b)) beneficiaries of an insured pension fund against loss of benefits to which they are entitled under such pension fund arising from—

(1) failure of the amounts contributed to such fund to provide benefits anticipated at the time such fund was established, if such failure is attributable to cessation of one or more of the operations carried on by him in one or more facilities of such employer; or

(2) losses realized upon the sale of investments of such fund if the sale is required to provide benefits payable by such fund.

(b) The rights of beneficiaries of an insured pension fund shall only be insured under the program to the extent that such rights do not exceed—

(1) in the case of a right to a monthly retirement or disability benefit for the employee himself, the lesser of 50 per centum of his average monthly wage in the five-year period for which his earnings were the greatest or $500 per month;

(2) in the case of a right on the part of one or more dependents, or members of the family, of the employee, or in the case of a right to a lump-sum survivor benefit on account of the death of an employee, an amount found by the Secretary to be reasonably related to the amount determined under subparagraph (1).

In the case of a periodic benefit which is paid on other than a monthly basis, the monthly equivalent of such benefit shall be regarded as the amount of the monthly benefit for purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence.

(c) If an eligible pension fund has not been insured under the program for each of at least the three years preceding the time when there occurs the contingency insured against, the rights of beneficiaries shall not be insured and in lieu thereof the contributions made on behalf of such pension fund during such period shall be returned to the pension fund.

PREMIUM FOR PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM

SEC. 5. (a) Each eligible pension fund may, upon application therefor, obtain insurance under the program upon payment of such annual premium as may be established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall establish separate premium rates for insurance against each of the contingencies described in section 4(a)(1) and section 4(a)(2). In establishing such premium rates for insurance against the contingency described in section 4(a)(2), the Secretary shall provide that the rate shall vary, to whatever extent is appropriate, for different classes of investments. Premium rates established under this section shall be uniform for all pension funds insured by the program and shall be applied to the amount of the unfunded obligations and assets or class of assets, respectively, of each insured pension fund. The premium rates may be changed from year to year by the Secretary, when the Secretary determines changes to be necessary or desirable to give effect to the purposes of this Act; but in no event shall the premium rate established for the contingency described in section 4(a)(1) exceed one per centum for each dollar of unfunded obligations, nor shall the aggregate premium payable by any insured pension fund for the contingency described in section 4(a)(2) exceed one-quarter of one per centum of the assets of such fund.

(b) The Secretary, in determining premium rates, and in establishing formulas for determining unfunded obligations and assets of pension funds, shall consult with, and be guided by the advice of, the Advisory Council (established by sec. 8).

(c) If the Secretary (after consulting with the Advisory Council) determines that, because of the limitation on rate of premium established under subsection (a) or for other reasons, it is not feasible to insure against loss of rights of all beneficiaries of insured pension funds, then the Secretary shall insure the rights of beneficiaries in accordance with the following order of priorities—

(1) First: individuals who, at the time when there occurs the contingency insured against, are receiving benefits under the pension fund, and individuals who have attained normal retirement age or if no normal retirement age is fixed have reached the age when an unreduced old age benefit is payable under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, and who are eligible, upon retirement, for retirement benefits under the pension fund;

(2) Second: individuals who, at such time, have attained the age for early retirement and who are entitled, upon early retirement, to early retirement benefits under the pension fund; or, if the pension fund plan does not provide for early retirement, individuals who, at such time, have attained age

sixty and who, under such pension fund, are eligible for benefits upon retirement;

(3) Third: individuals who, at such time, have attained age forty-five;

(4) Fourth: individuals who, at such time, have attained age forty; and

(5) Fifth: in addition to individuals described in the above priorities, such other individuals as the Secretary, after consulting with the Advisory Council, shall prescribe.

(d) Participation in the program by a pension fund shall be terminated by the Secretary upon failure, after such reasonable period as the Secretary shall prescribe, of such pension fund to make payment of premiums due for participation in the program. Participation by any pension fund in the program may be terminated by such fund at any time by giving not less than sixty days' notice of termination to the Secretary.

REVOLVING FUND

SEC. 6. (a) In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Secretary shall establish a revolving fund into which all amounts paid into the program as premiums shall be deposited and from which all liabilities incurred under the program shall be paid.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treasury such amounts as may be necessary, for deposit into the revolving fund, to meet the liabilities of the program. Moneys borrowed from the Treasury shall bear a rate of interest determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be equal to the average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the period such moneys are borrowed. Such moneys shall be repaid by the Secretary from premiums paid into the revolving fund.

(c) Moneys in the revolving fund not required for current operations shall be invested in obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

SEC. 7. (a) Section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of qualified pension and other similar plans) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, no pension fund which, for any taxable year is insurable under the Federal Reinsurance of Private Pension Plans Act, shall be a qualified pension plan under this section if such fund is not insured for such year under the program established under such Act."

(b) Section 404(a)(2) of such Code (relating to deductibility of contributions to employees' annuities) is amended by striking out "section 401(a) (9) and (10)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 401(a) (9), (10), and (11)".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years which begin not less than six months after the date of enactment of this Act.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby created a Federal Advisory Council for Insurance of Employees' Pension Funds (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Council"), which shall consist of nine members, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall select, for appointment to the Council, individuals who are, by reason of training or experience, or both, familiar with and competent to deal with, problems involving employees' pension funds and problems relating to the insurance of such funds. Members of the Council shall be appointed for a term of two years.

(b) Members shall be compensated at the rate of $100 per day for each day they are engaged in the duties of the Advisory Council and shall be entitled to reimbursement for traveling expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of the Council. The Advisory Council shall meet at Washington, District of Columbia, upon call of the Secretary who shall serve as Chairman of the Council. Meetings shall be called by such Chairman not less often than twice each year.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Advisory Council to consult with and advise the Secretary with respect to the administration of this Act.

The explanation presented by Mr. HARTKE is as follows:

PUBLIC REINSURANCE FOR PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

A. PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM

To establish a Federal system of reinsurance for private pension plans. The program would be financed by premiums to be paid by pension funds as a condition of qualification for favorable tax treatment under the Internal Revenue Code. Such a program would be similar to the program of insurance of deposits in savings banks and savings and loan associations through the Federal Deposit Insurance and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporations and the insurance of the mortgage obligation to make future payments under the Federal Housing Act.

B. NEED FOR THE PROGRAM

Congress has provided through legislation strong incentives for the establishment of private pension plans. Although the response has been gratifying in terms of the numbers of such plans which have been instituted, the very fact that most pension programs have been in existence for so few years, has created a serious problem. Since most pension plans are newly created they are still far from being fully funded even where a program of funding has been undertaken. In fact, present tax regulations preclude the funding of past service liabilities in less than about 12 years; they do not require that they be funded at all.

As a result, termination of a pension plan may mean that the funds accumulated are inadequate to even pay full pensions to those nearing retirement age, let alone to protect the benefit expectations of other workers who may find that the security they thought they had established for their older years, through the accumulation of pension credits, has disappeared overnight. The recent closing of the Studebaker Corp. South Bend, Ind., automobile plant illustrates the problem. Although Studebaker had been funding past service over a 30-year period, the moneys accumulated in the fund are only sufficient to insure benefits (payable at age 65) to workers who are now 60 and over. Workers in their fifties with more than 30 years of pension credits will never receive a single dollar in pension benefits even though they have met the requirements for vesting established by the plan.

The proposal embodied herein would insure to the worker at least some measure of the security which he has rightly come to expect; and because of its self-financing feature would not result in the expenditure of 1 cent of public funds. It would protect a worker's investment in a pension fund just as his savings are insured if deposited in a savings bank or a savings and loan association which are protected by insurance through a Government corporation. It would also insure the obligations of the fund to make future payments to him just as a mortgagee's right to receive future mortgage payments is insured by FHA.

C. PENSION RIGHTS PROTECTED

It is hoped that within the maximum premium rate set by the bill that all credits earned under all private pension plans will be able to be protected against the risk of termination. If, however, the premium should prove to be insufficient, the bill establishes a series of priorities for protection.

The highest priority would go to those who have already retired and who are receiving a pension and to those who are eligible to retire under the terms of their plan and who have attained normal retirement age. Next in line for consideration would be those who are eligible to retire by virtue of having attained the age specified in the plan for early retirement. If early retirement is not provided, age 60, the usual age for early retirement, should be used.

Third in line for possible coverage would be those workers whether or not eligible to retire who are over the age of 45 and who therefore presumably will find it impossible to accumulate sufficient new credits to provide adequately for their old age.

Fourth in the line of priorities would be those workers who have reached the age of 40. And last, reinsurance would be provided for all pension credits regardless of the age of the individual at the time of termination. This last classification would of course provide the complete coverage of every earned pension credit referred to earlier as the ultimate goal of this proposal. The desirability of such extensive coverage, if at all feasible, need not be restated.

It should be understood that insurance of credits in the third, fourth, and last priorities would not mean immediate payments from the pension reinsurance system. Payments would only be made when the individual reaches the normal retirement age.

D. PENSION PLANS ELIGIBLE FOR INSURANCE

The proposal contemplates insurance for all private pension plans which qualify under the Internal Revenue Code and which have been in operation and have paid premiums for a specified number of years before the insurance became effective would seem necessary. Such a suicide clause would seem necessary to prevent the establishment of a program with the knowledge that the plan will be terminated for one of several reasons. This would exclude "pay as you go" plans but would include all funded plans whether insured or trusteed. This would include plans which provide for terminal funding, which provide only for the funding of future service liabilities, and which provide for the funding of both past and future service liabilities. It is recognized, of course, that since these different types of plans have significantly different levels of funding, that the unfunded liabilities will vary from plan to plan. Since it is this unfunded liability that will be insured, the amount of the individual plan's premium will be computed on the basis of the amount of unfunded liability.

While the bill proposes to insure all qualified pension plans, further study may prove it necessary to require a reasonable amortization program (30 or 40 years) for past service liabilities. Such a requirement may be necessary if it is determined that the reinsurance scheme would progressively become more expensive because of the large unfunded liabilities of aging firms.

The only limitation which I believe should be placed on this all-inclusive aspect of the insurance is one related to the amount of benefit which any particular plan promises to its members. This would be similar to the limitation of $10,000 of savings which are eligible for insurance under existing programs. Such limitations are set forth in the bill.

E. RISKS AGAINST WHICH THE SYSTEM SHOULD INSURE

The reinsurance system would insure against all risks to earned pension credits if it is to provide a meaningful sense of security to the employee. These risks fall into two categories: (1) risks to the plan which depend on the degree to which it is funded,

and (2) risks to the plan which depend on forces outside of it and which operate irrespective of the extent to which it is funded.

A clear example of a risk in the first category would be the termination of a plan because of the business failure of the employer. In such a case the risk insured against would be its unfunded liability which is attributable to the rights which are insured. As previously pointed out, the premium for insurance of this risk would be determined by the amount of unfunded liabilities.

Since the reinsurance plan is basically underwriting the benefit levels set forth in the plan, the amount of the unfunded liability, both for the purpose of determining the liability insured and the premium charged, would be determined on the basis of a set of standard actuarial assumptions. These actuarial assumptions could be determined by the Secretary on the basis of consultation with the Advisory Council established specifically for the purpose of consultation on the proposed program.

When the employer has not gone out of business, but has closed a plant or reduced the work force, continued funding of the past service liability may become such a burden as to jeopardize the existence of the remaining operation. To protect the rights of both terminating and continuing employees, the bill provides that where there is a partial termination, determined in accordance with recent Internal Revenue Service Regulations (code sec. 401(a)(7)), an appropriate portion of the assets would be allocated to the terminating employees. The reinsurance would then pick up any additional liability on behalf of those employees. The employer would continue operation of his plan, with the remaining assets, on behalf of the continuing employees.

The second type of risk different from those which we have been discussing and which should be insured against, is the risk of depreciation of the funded assets. The risk involved in the situation is probably very slight and is not dependent on the size of the unfunded liability. The premium for this risk is, therefore, computed separately than the premium for insuring the unfunded liabilities. While the risk here would depend upon the types of assets, it would probably be administratively unfeasible, as well as undesirable to set reinsurance premiums for individual investments at the same time the bill provides for varying premium by class of assets; i.e., Government bonds, stocks, mortgages, etc.

Since the premiums established, particularly with respect to the second risk outlined above, may eventually prove to be excessive, the legislation includes a provision authorizing the administrator to provide for the suspension or reduction of either type of premium for a period of time.

F. ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF REINSURANCE SYSTEM

The most logical existing agency to administer the system of reinsurance for private pension plans would be the Social Security Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In addition to having the actuarial and technical personnel who are engaged in a similar operation, the administration by the social security offices would provide an opportunity for automatic notification to a prospective pensioner under a private plan at the time he files an application for social security benefits.

The legislation authorizes the Secretary to borrow moneys from the Treasury for the establishment of a reinsurance fund. This money would be repaid by the premiums which the fund would receive and the legislation would thereby achieve a self-financing status at no cost to the public.

AMENDMENT OF THE OPEN SPACES PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in 1961 the Congress approved the open spaces program, which I am proud to say was one of the major proposals on my legislative agenda. Enacted as title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, this brandnew program authorized Federal grants to State and local bodies for the acquisition of desperately needed tracts of open, undeveloped land.

Since 1961, I have paid close attention to the workings of the program and most especially to any practical problems which might arise as the program evolved within the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Inevitably, the program developed some difficulties, and I became aware of certain obstacles facing localities wishing to make use of the funds. After a good deal of thought and consultation with both local and Federal officials, I concluded that the program could be significantly strengthened with two changes. Consequently, I am today offering the following amendments to my open spaces program.

These suggested amendments seek to improve the program—which has proved so extraordinarily useful to our State and local governments—in two significant ways. First, I want to raise the present 20- to 30-percent Federal grants to a straight matching 50 percent for any qualified unit of local government. Second, I want to expand this program by making its funds available, not only for acquisition, as is presently authorized, but also for the development of land for any appropriate open space use, whether recreational, historic, or scenic.

In support of these amendments I would like to again stress the well known and much discussed growth of our urban areas. According to a recent study made by the Urban Renewal Administration, more than 1 million acres of land a year are being converted to satisfy the needs of our steadily growing urban society.

Today our population is 70 percent urban in character. By 1980, 80 percent of the country will be classified as urban. Right now my own State of New Jersey seems to lead all other States with its rate of 90 percent of urbanization. Growth in major metropolitan centers accounted for 97 percent of our population increase between 1950 and 1960—clearly, this trend has not slackened for a minute.

But it is not land we lack, Mr. President. Rather, it is proper and effective planning for available land, that we have so far failed to supply. Indeed, if the entire population of the United States were spread out evenly across the United States, each person could have a 10-acre lot. Or as Charles Abrams has put it:

In the new contest for homes and space there is no shortage of land in the United States. Its whole population can be housed on the coast of California at 12 families to the acre with everyone having a view of the Pacific Ocean.

Obviously, from a realistic standpoint, we must work within the context of continued urbanization. We must strive to develop a logical land use policy that will provide the maximum of social benefit to present and future inhabitants of our metropolitan areas.

Superficially the choice may be between ugly urban sprawl and rational, planned, urbanization—in reality we are concerned with the entire machinery for land allocation in this country. We must not let this issue merely be resolved as an inadvertent byproduct of solutions to other major urban problems. We can afford nothing less than a conscious and explicit exercise of choice.

President John Kennedy had this sort of choice in mind when he asked Congress, in 1961, to authorize the open-space land program. As President Kennedy noted in his remarkably far seeing housing message of that year:

Land is the most precious resource in the metropolitan area. The present patterns of haphazard suburban development are contributing to a tragic waste in the use of a vital resource now being consumed at an alarming rate.

I was proud to play a major role in enacting legislation under which Congress authorized $75 million for an open-space program and appropriated funds for immediate use in early 1962. As of December 31, 1964, this new program had assisted 197 communities in the acquisition of more than 115,000 acres of land to be devoted to permanent open space.

In my State of New Jersey 36 projects have been committed involving 22,932 acres and a Federal grant of $3.5 million. The fact that 10 of those projects were authorized during this past fiscal year is indicative of the continuing and increasing use of the program.

Mr. President, this is a good start by the Federal Government but it can be considered no more than a start. In fact, a few States are even now way ahead of the Federal Government in recognizing the needs of local communities for space preservation.

For example, in 1961, New Jersey voted a $60 million green acres program, $20 million of which will go to local communities for open space purchases. New York, in November of 1960, voted a $75 million open-space bond issue, and endorsed an additional $25 million bond issue in November of 1962.

In Wisconsin, a 10-year, $50 million program to preserve open space is underway, and is being financed through a 1-cent increase in the State cigarette tax.

I think it would be well, Mr. President, if we compared these State efforts with the Federal open-space land program. Thus far, Federal grants have run to but $35.9 million for the whole United States.

One reason for this low level of Federal expenditure has been the 20- to 30-percent Federal share of the acquisition cost.

Under the above-mentioned programs, the State of New York will pay up to 75 percent of the acquisition cost of open-space land, New Jersey will pay up to 50 percent and Wisconsin will also pay up to 50 percent. Local communities—those already most hard pressed in the squeeze between diminishing local

revenues and accelerating local needs—must supply the remainder of the funds.

At a minimum, I see no reason to limit Federal participation to less than that authorized under existing State programs. If our efforts at the Federal level are to be successful, we should make assistance large enough to be of realistically available value to harried local communities. As the program now stands, some local units of government, desirous as they are of Federal help for open lands, just cannot find the necessary 60 or 70 percent to contribute to the cost of the land.

Moreover, Mr. President, I see no reason why Federal funds should pay 75 percent of the cost of the work in wildlife restoration projects or 50 percent of the development of local airport facilities, when only 20 to 30 percent is available to preserve our open space.

For these reasons, I propose that the 20- to 30-percent limitation be changed to allow a 50-percent Federal contribution to the open-space land program. In this way, many many more localities, especially under progressive State programs, will be able to participate in the open spaces program and take full advantage of the Federal Government's helping hand.

In addition, I wish to amend the 1961 housing act so that these 50-percent Federal grants can be made available for the improvement, rather than just the initial acquisition, of these acres of green land. As the program now operates, many communities are literally "stuck" with large undeveloped tracts of urban land due to their inability to secure funds for further improvement.

Thus, these communities are barred from turning barren scrubland into a delightful park or from providing certain improvements so that natural scenic vistas could be viewed and appreciated by all.

Under my proposed amendment, Federal funds would pay up to 50 percent of the cost of acquiring and improving land for appropriate open-space uses. This change is a realistic one, which simply recognizes that private funds can't find more profitable uses than the development of nonprofit recreational projects.

It also recognizes that the local governmental units, especially the small ones, have a difficult enough time providing the absolute bare minimums in public service such as education and police protection.

In short, I think these amendments to the open spaces bill will aid in our task of building "a community for the enrichment of the life of man." As President Johnson explained it in his recent housing message:

> Our task is to put the highest concerns of our people at the center of urban growth and activity. It is to create and preserve the sense of community with others which gives us significance and security, a sense of belonging and of sharing in the common life.

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

The bill (S. 1577) to authorize assistance under title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 for the development for open-space uses of land acquired under such title, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. NELSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (AMENDMENT NO. 56)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 500, the bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. The amendment I submit today would restore to Bermuda and other adjacent islands nonquota status for purposes of immigration.

From 1921 to 1934 adjacent islands were not included among those countries upon which we imposed quota restrictions. These islands were, in fact, treated similarly to the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. In 1924 these adjacent islands, including Bermuda, the Bahamas, the Netherlands Antilles, Barbados, and Port au Spain were given subquota status under their home governments.

Times and political climates have changed since 1924. Cuba enjoys a nonquota status now while these friendly islands must, insofar as immigration to the United States is concerned, continue to work with severe restrictions.

Mr. President, I submit that this situation is unfair, serves no purpose of ours and should be remedied.

I want to assure the Senate that this amendment will not cause large numbers of people to begin to immigrate into the United States. The total population of all of the islands which would be included in this amendment barely exceeds 1 million people. This amendment merely seeks to offer to the people of these islands the same privileges enjoyed by the rest of their neighbors. I do not believe it would stretch a point or strain our relations with Great Britain, the Netherlands, or any other country to remove the present restrictions.

Mr. President, I request that this amendment lie on the table for 10 days so other Senators may join in cosponsoring it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment (No. 56) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENFORCEMENT OF 15TH AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 57)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] may be added to my bill, the Human Investment Act of 1965, S. 1130, as cosponsors, and that their names may be included among the list of Senators who are cosponsors at the next printing of the bill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 1180) introduced by the senior Senator from Connecticut on February 18, to amend the Federal Firearms Act, the name of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, also on behalf of the senior Senator from Connecticut, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the resolution (S. Res. 30), to amend the standing rules of the Senate relative to the Select Committee on Small Business, the name of the senior Senator from Connecticut be added as a cosponsor.

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

NOTICE OF HEARINGS RELATING TO HOUSING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on March 29, 1965, on S. 1354, the President's 1965 housing bill, and other measures pending before the subcommittee. The hearings, expected to last 2 weeks, will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, and will commence at 10 a.m. each day.

The following is a list of bills which are presently pending before the subcommittee and which will be included in the hearings: S. 506, S. 519, S. 712, S. 786, S. 946, S. 1182, S. 1183, S. 1354, and S. 1532.

Persons wishing to testify on these measures should contact Mrs. Dixie T. Lamb, Housing Subcommittee, room 5228, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce that further hearings will be held by this subcommittee on the question of reapportionment of State legislatures. Dates for these hearings are April 1, 2, 6, 7, and 13, 1965. I would like to note that these hearings will be held in room

2226, New Senate Office Building, the Judiciary Committee hearing room, beginning at 10 a.m.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 18, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week"; and

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution for Bennett Place commemoration.

RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF CITY OF SAN JOSE, CALIF., REQUESTING PRESIDENT TO ENFORCE FEDERAL LAWS IN SELMA, ALA.—RESOLUTION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Council of the City of San Jose, Calif., by unanimous vote, adopted a resolution on March 8, expressing its indignation at the recent convulsions and violence in Selma, Ala., and calling upon the President of the United States to take such action as to prevent similar outrages from occurring in the future. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be set forth in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION 27090

Resolution of the Council of the City of San Jose requesting the President of the United States to enforce Federal laws in Selma, Ala.

Whereas the citizens of the city of San Jose, Calif., have been alarmed and deeply concerned by the brutal and senseless police action against certain other American citizens in the city of Selma, Ala.; and

Whereas there is existing Federal legislation which could be enforced to insure to our fellow countrymen the right of peaceful assembly and the right to participate in self-government through the power to vote: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of San Jose, That the President of the United States be requested to take action to stop the outrageous mistreatment of American citizens by misguided local and State officials in the State of Alabama, and to assure that the constitutional rights of all citizens in all States are protected at all times.

J. L. PACE, M.D., *Mayor.*

Attest:

FRANCIS L. GREINER,
City Clerk.

By ROY H. HUBBARD,
Deputy.

TRIBUTE TO GUY JOHNSON, JR.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, an example of Maine initiative and ingenuity at its best is the project of Guy Johnson, Jr., of Great Island, Maine, a neighbor of mine. He is developing a Maine shrimp industry which promises to give Louisiana some competition. I hope that some day I will be able to provide the Members of the Senate with this delicacy of Maine.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point an excellent article on this project, by Richard Taylor, in one of Maine's outstanding newspapers, the Brunswick Record, and specifically the issue of February 18, 1965.

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

NEW SHRIMP PEELER HELPS KEEP FISHING FLEET BUSY

(By Richard Taylor)

HARPSWELL.—Shrimps, once considered a delicacy to be savored only in hot sauce, may be a common product of the sea on your table in the near future if plans conceived by Guy Johnson, Jr., of Great Island, materialize. The knotty problem of separating this delicacy from its shell has been overcome by automated machines and no longer does the housewife get sore fingers in preparing this food.

The automatic shrimp peeling machine in operation at Shrimp Lab Inc., at Great Island, takes an average of 2 minutes plus to process a shrimp ready for packaging and shipping to market. More than 25,000 pounds of this seafood has been shipped from this new sea processing plant with an estimated 100,000 pounds scheduled for next season.

This operation has given a shot in the arm to local area fishermen with seven boats dragging shrimps for the machine. Other shrimp dealers are sending their catch over to the machine for processing, finding it easier than other methods being used. At an average 350 pounds per hour, this machine and process promises good pay and a market for many boats without work during long winter months.

NO EASY JOB

Shrimping is not an easy job. It involves rising at the cold early morning hour of 2 a.m., steaming 10 to 20 miles offshore to the shrimp schools and putting in a long day that can run to 16 hours of labor. Add winter weather, the uncertain bottom that tears a net to tatters, and it is easy to see why shrimping is not considered an easy job. Markets and shrimp runs will affect the future of this business; however, at the present time there are some 40 boats dragging in the offshore waters.

HOW LONG THE SHRIMP?

This new technique has raised some questions concerning the potential shrimp population. Will continued heavy dragging deplete this food supply? This is speculation. Although this Gulf of Maine shrimp is not related to the Louisiana shrimp, it has been many years since the first southern shrimp was dragged from the bottom for human consumption and there seems to be no depletion of the southern supply. Gulf of Maine shrimp are smaller, some gourmets think tastier, and range from Cape Cod north. They are also found along the shores of Norway, Finland, and Denmark. In Norway, as a table delicacy they command $1.20 per pound in the American equivalent money.

WHY FEMALES?

One of the biggest handicaps in selling this product unpeeled has been the eggs on the shrimps. Shrimps are not male or female as commonly designated, being both at some phase of their cycle. At the time they are caught by the draggers off the Maine Coast, they are female with eggs to prove it. These eggs have no eye appeal to the bargain hunting housewife as she peers into the fish market. In fact, they look dirty and hardly worth the effort to make them edible. Peeled shrimp have a ready market.

To those who have raised the question on the wisdom of catching so many female shrimps laden with eggs, the experts on shrimps advise that this is the primary reason they are here to be caught. Once having shed their eggs, the shrimps depart for parts unknown. Biologically, it boils down to female shrimps or no shrimps.

GROWING ENTERPRISE

Shrimp Lab Inc. is a growing enterprise which promises to expand as it finds better markets and improved supplies. At present they employ 21 workers, operating in 2 shifts. Corporation officers include Guy Johnson, Jr., president; Mrs. Patrica Lowery, treasurer; Mrs. Helen Johnson, vice president; and James Weir, corporation counsel, secretary.

MEDICARE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been increased discussion concerning the Hospital Insurance Act of 1965, commonly referred to as medicare.

At the 75th anniversary celebration of the Johns Hopkins Hospital Department of Medicine, Walter F. Perkins, trustee emeritus and past chairman of the hospital board, took a hard, realistic look at the need for a program of health care for people over the age of 65. As a man with over 22 years as a trustee of one of the greatest hospitals in the world, Mr. Perkins gave his wholehearted support to the King-Anderson bill which I am proud to cosponsor.

Mr. Perkins' experience allows him to speak as a man understanding the problems of people, hospital administrations, and the medical professions.

The remarks, which I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, were made before a large and distinguished audience which included the Surgeon General of the United States and the heads of the medical departments of many great medical schools. I believe that my distinguished colleagues will find Mr. Perkins' comments extremely timely and interesting.

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

THE JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE, 75TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION, FEBRUARY 25, 1965, GREETINGS BY WALTER F. PERKINS, TRUSTEE EMERITUS AND PAST CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

It is my pleasant duty to welcome you on behalf of the trustees and officers of the hospital. We are highly honored in having such a distinguished group of former members of the department of medicine participating in today's program.

You celebrate the 75th anniversary of the opening of the hospital on May 7, 1889, an event of far-reaching importance. It was the first step in the creation of the Johns Hopkins medical institutions, visualized by Mr. Hopkins in his letter to the original hospital trustees directing that: "In all your arrangements in relation to this hospital you will bear constantly in mind that it is my wish and purpose that the institution shall ultimately form a part of the medical school of the university." For 75 years there has been the closest cooperation between the hospital and the medical school.

The stream of life that has poured through the hospital has changed incessantly. Patients, nurses, doctors, students, administrators, and trustees have come and gone. Its work is never done; one crisis passes only to be followed by another; it is forever in need of new methods; obsolescence is a constant

problem; everything must be tried but only that which is good can be kept.

There have been many changes during the past 75 years but nothing like those we may expect in the years ahead. This is an age of drastic, violent, revolutionary changes. An age when suppressed minorities are demanding their civil rights. An age when people are throwing off the yoke of tyrants. An age of intense international competition. An age of exploding scientific knowledge. An age of unparalleled population growth with all the attendant problems of urbanization and congestion, poverty, sickness, unemployment, and lawlessness. It is an age of upheaval, ferment, and instability, characterized by new and strange social, economic and political forces.

But who would want to go back to what some people call "the good old days"? Who would swap their modern automobile for a horse and buggy? Who would prefer spending 3 days' traveling by train to the west coast than 4 hours by jet? How many of you would care to practice the kind of medicine your grandfathers knew?

Times are changing and all of us must change with them. And that goes for the medical profession as well as everyone else. Last Friday night the president of the American Medical Association attended a special meeting of the house of delegates of the State medical society which voted a $140,000 war chest to battle medicare in Maryland, which is to be raised by an assessment of $50 against the 2,800 Maryland physicians.

Dr. Ward said, and I quote, "The adoption of medicare will permit the Government to enlarge and expand the program as they see fit. We know that everything the Government subsidizes they control. Such control would deprive the patient of free choice of hospital, and eventually free choice of physician." Such distortion of the truth would not be surprising coming from an irresponsible person but is appalling from the president of a great professional society. And even worse there was wild talk of expulsion for those members who don't pay the assessment and even of a physicians' strike if the bill is passed. The American people are getting fed up with that sort of nonsense and the Members of the Congress know it only too well.

They are deeply concerned about the 16 million people now over age 65 in this great prosperous Nation, where the best of hospital care is available, many of whom cannot afford to pay for needed hospital care or even pay the premiums for hospital insurance. Everybody agrees that they must be taken care of. The only question is, Who pays for it?

I believe that, because of rising hospital costs and the increasing numbers of people over age 65, the answer is the administration sponsored Hospital Insurance, Social Security and Public Assistance Amendments of 1965—generally known as medicare—now before the Congress. The bill provides for compulsory hospital insurance financed by payments from all social security and railway retirement participants into a completely separate trust fund. Participants would become eligible for benefits somewhat better than present Blue Cross benefits upon reaching age 65. Persons now over 65 receiving social security benefits would be eligible for hospital benefits without additional payments. Others would have to be taken care of from general revenue as at present. This legislation does not subsidize or pay for physicians services and could not influence the free choice of a physician in any way. It is high time the AMA got on with the job of formulating policies that can be offered to the public with some hope of acceptance.

I know that this is a subject that many doctors and others who feel as I do would rather not talk about. But after 22 years as a trustee of this hospital, half of which as its chief executive officer, I feel it is my privilege and my duty to speak out. A great puzzle to me is the tendency of so many people to point their finger away from themselves instead of indulging in searching self-examination in a real effort to adapt to a changing world.

And now a word about the Johns Hopkins medical institutions. It is my opinion that they have never been in better shape or in better hands. They are strong, both financially and intellectually. Their leadership is able and dedicated. Morale is high. The next 25 years may well see their greatest contribution to research, teaching, and patient care.

I really envy those of you who will be so fortunate as to be able to attend the centennial celebration in 1989. I am sure it will be, as the Irish say, "a proud day."

Again may I tell you how pleased I am to have the honor of greeting you. I hope that today's events will be both profitable and enjoyable.

POVERTY AND THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 13, 1965, the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] spoke before the Exeter League of Women Voters. He spoke to them about the problems of modern poverty and explained how the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is designed to help in the war against poverty that President Johnson has called on all Americans to wage.

I commend his stirring remarks from that evening to all of my distinguished colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for Senator MCINTYRE's speech to be printed in the RECORD.

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

AN ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR TOM MCINTYRE, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, BEFORE THE EXETER LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, EXETER, N.H., MARCH 13, 1965

I am delighted to be here tonight in Exeter, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you about the problems of modern poverty and about the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

I have always had the highest respect for the League of Women Voters. I think it will make an excellent ally in the war on poverty. In fact, I can think of no organization more effectively equipped to help present the facts of this fight to the American people.

As I understand it, the League has performed a unique and important service to this country. It set out some 50 years ago to encourage the informed participation of women in the affairs of State and, I dare say, it has succeeded beyond its fondest dreams. By its unbiased exploration of issues, by its courageous stand on some of the most critical policies of our times, it has provided considerable understanding and incentive to the voters.

I congratulate you and your fellow members throughout the country on your great and good work.

Needless to say, I read your recent pamphlet. "Prospects for Education and Employment" with great interest. It is excellent. I was impressed by the force of the analysis and by many of the questions raised.

There is, of course, little doubt that education and employment—the two major elements of our economic life—describe the largest battle zones in the poverty war. The critical engagements most certainly will take place on this hazardous and difficult terrain. So will the important breakthroughs.

Our country has declared war on human want and misery. This is a meaningful declaration and one that no other country in the world has ever made.

The President has asked for total victory in this war, and his is not an empty demand. One of the most significant facts of our time, and one that cannot be stressed enough, is that victory is now possible.

We in America have identified and isolated the causes of poverty. We know it to be a paralyzing cycle that must be permanently broken. We have the knowledge and the ingenuity to wage the fight. We have the technical ability. We have the productive capacity. We have the wealth. And we will have the necessary will when we no longer piously pretend that the poor will always be with us.

Though we must eliminate poverty, we cannot wipe it out today, tomorrow, or even in this generation, so entrenched and snarled are the problems of the poor in our affluent society.

Thirty years ago, some of you may remember, this country suffered from mass, visible poverty. Ringing words declared that one-third of this Nation was ill clothed, ill housed, and ill fed. The poor were everywhere to see—on street corners, on breadlines, in railroad tenements.

Today we have become the richest, most powerful nation on the face of the earth. Yet three decades of enormous economic expansion, enormous technological change, miraculous breakthroughs in health research, vast public welfare programs and privately financed charities—have not substantially reduced the incidence of poverty. Ironically, these things have cloaked and concealed it. The daily reminders are gone.

Super highways, expressways, and beltways carry us around the poor and the evidence of their poverty.

I find it shocking and rebuking, as I know you do, that in affluent mid-20th-century America more than 30 million people are still in the wasteland of grinding poverty. I find it shocking and tragic that 11 million of these are children who have nothing to look forward to but a future of poverty unless their environments and their outlooks are completely remolded.

There is a tendency today to think that modern poverty is a condition that affects only Negroes and minority groups, and is found mostly in the slums of sprawling metropolitan cities—or, perhaps, in a few economically exhausted mining towns. Nothing is further from the truth.

Poverty exists in every State, every county, and every community in this land. It cuts into every age group, every ethnic group, every segment of our economic life and every geographic area. The sordid fact is that more than half of the poverty in America exists in the rural areas.

Make no mistake. The magnitude of the problem and the magnitude of the challenge of poverty are just a drop in the bucket compared to the size of the task that lies ahead.

Very few of us here tonight, I suspect, have ever known real poverty or can really understand what it means to be poor in these times. We have an abstract, statistical knowledge, to be sure. But do we really have any conception at all of the degrading sights and sounds and smells of poverty?

What must it be like to live where there is no privacy and no silence? What must it be like to live in dim light, to breath stagnant air? What must it be like to be a child, rejected and unwanted, in a house with no love, no books, no conversation and no hope?

The real tragedy of poverty, it seems to be, is not to be understood in material terms. It is not just lack of money and lack of goods. The real tragedy of the poor is the cultural

isolation that poverty so relentlessly enforces—the lack of human contact except among others who are poor.

I think that we all must come to know and to understand the poor if they are to be permanently helped. How many of us can say with raw honesty that we have not been indifferent and complacent about this business of poverty? Most of us simply give money and leave the human contacts to the welfare experts.

It's possible that some of our more economically comfortable citizens could benefit by a system of "poverty retreats" which might be organized along community lines. By willingly giving over a day or a weekend to such an exercise; by willingly living among the poor, each of us could learn a great deal. We would learn what it is to talk with someone who is poor instead of about him. We could learn to work with him instead of for him. An experience such as this could well inspire the kind of personal commitment that must be made in the war on poverty.

I feel strongly that individual and group commitment at the grassroots will prove to be the sustaining force in our mighty national effort. Individual personal commitment is needed in much greater measure than detached Gallup poll approval of the commitment of the Federal Government.

What makes the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 such a singular and hopeful piece of legislation as far as I am concerned, is the emphasis it places on individual and community action and the stress it places on three-way Federal, State, and local cooperation.

Response to human need, as you know, is not new in the legislative history of the United States of America. The President reminded us of this in his poverty message: "The Congress," he said, "is charged by the Constitution to provide * * * for the general welfare. Now Congress is being asked to extend that welfare to all our people."

The President's words simply and eloquently describe that the Economic Opportunity Act is designed to begin to do. It is not the first, and it will not be the last step in the poverty war. Some of its provisions are based on old ideas, others are bold new ideas. Some will work, others may have to be reexamined and improved. But the intention of every single provision is to give the impoverished a chance to help themselves.

The bill rejects measure which make the poverty class more dependent. Its immediate goal is to devise some cures for poverty. Its long-range goal, more implied than spelled out by its architects, is to restore and rehabilitate every single victim of poverty in this country.

The heart of the act, in my opinion, is the community action program defined in title II. This will rely heavily on traditional, local American ingenuity—on get-up-and-go—with which, I might add, New Hampshire is abundently blessed.

Briefly, this part of the act is intended to encourage communities to pool their resources with governmental and private groups, with business and civic organizations, in order to develop projects which will improve conditions under which the people of poverty live, learn, and earn.

All too often in the past, communities have tried to field poverty projects but have been frustrated by inadequate funds—or a lack of comprehensive plans. The Office of Economic Opportunity, created by the act, can now give the kind of financial support and direction that has been missing.

Community programs so stimulated can be single-pronged or large and umbrella like depending on the special needs of its poor. The elements of a broad program might range across the areas of job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home management, remedial education, and so on.

By July of this year, according to my information, 400 local antipoverty programs will have been funded. Community action programs have a kind of a fission about them. Each one organized—whether it be on an Indian reservation, in a small town or in a large urban center—will provide experience, incentive, and determination upon which each new one can build.

Although community action programs can involve all age groups, three important programs of the act are focused on the youth of our country between 16 and 21 who are jobless school dropouts—with educations woefully incomplete and underdeveloped skills.

The Job Corps, which is one of these programs and about which you may have heard a good deal pro and con, already has several camps operating. One is Wilson Base in Arizona, where Job Corps men are developing extensive recreation facilities and controlling the erosion along the banks of the Little Colorado River. Another typical one is in Wellfleet on Cape Cod where initial plans call for sand dune stabilization, meadow reclamation, and the construction of trails and observation platforms.

Projects in these camps and similar ones will train young men in the skills of carpentry, masonry, surveying, plumbing, electrical work, painting, and the use of heavy equipment. They will be doing useful, decent work which would not otherwise be undertaken.

The pilot rural Job Corps camp is located in Cotoctin, Md.—a beautiful mountain spot not far from Washington. Here 60 boys from all races and every kind of deprived background are learning to read and write if necessary, are learning valuable skills, and are growing healthy and strong in an atmosphere of hope.

From all I am told, the Job Corps program will be a tremendous success. According to recent statistics, 150,000 applications have already been processed. Though only some 40,000 can be handled now in the camps and larger training centers, manpower training programs being conducted under the Manpower Development and Training Act, vocational high schools or Neighborhood Youth Corps groups will be able to absorb the rest.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is another type of work training process set in motion by the Economic Opportunity Act. It has, so far, been extremely successful. As of the present time, 113 projects have been authorized in 39 States which are providing employment opportunities for more than 75,000 youths.

The purpose of this corps, like the Job Corps, is to get the underprivileged, deprived youth of the Nation off the streets, back in school, and into jobs which will benefit the community.

One of the most noteworthy developments along the poverty front is the involvement of some of our largest electronic firms in the operation of Job Corps and work training centers. The corporate giants, one by one, are turning their attention to poverty-linked educational problems, and computers are being brought up to the frontlines. They are interested in introducing new, mechanized teaching techniques to the educational rehabilitation process. Some of these techniques, already successfully tested, could have an enormous impact on the poverty war.

One of them which I find promising, and about which you may already know, is called the "talking typewriter." It was invented in 1958 by a Rutgers professor, Omar Moore, and has immense possibilities.

With this device, which involves a computerized typewriter and television, I'm told that a sullen, hostile, illiterate teenager can be brought up to a sixth grade learning level in a matter of months, and can be transformed into a happy, hopeful human being.

But we must not become complacent if we achieve some dramatic results in our youth program.

Neither the Job Corps camps and training centers nor the Neighborhood Youth Corps will permanently turn the young men and women into model citizens, both socially and economically productive. The wounds of despair, deprivation, and delinquency are too deep and too extensive for this to happen overnight.

You know this and I know this and one of the challenges of our mighty assault on poverty, let me say, is that we must continue to act on this knowledge.

In the same way that a plastic surgeon schedules a series of operations to rebuild human tissue, our antipoverty forces must schedule rehabilitation. The two youth programs we have discussed can be considered only a first "operation," a first step in rehabilitation.

We must follow through. The youth of our Nation is too precious a resource for only half a job. We must continue to help guide and counsel; most importantly, we must continue to offer opportunities that will allow the youth of our Nation to advance and to improve. Our antipoverty strategy must be open ended to be finally successful.

Time, unfortunately, will not permit me to discuss in detail other programs involved in the Antipoverty Act. But I do want to mention the good work being done by VISTA volunteers who are patterned after the Peace Corps, and the special assistance that is being offered to farmers and small businessmen threatened by poverty.

I also want to take a moment to talk about the college-level work-study project which round out the youth programs authorized by the act.

It is into this work-study area of the poverty fight that, I am proud to say, New Hampshire has put her first contingent of troops. Keene State College, Plymouth State College, and the University of New Hampshire have received grants. A fourth, I believe, is probable.

These college-level programs are a wonderful idea. They provide part-time work up to 15 hours a week for able students from low-income families, who, without a job, could not swing a college education.

The boys and girls enrolled in these programs can hold on-campus or off-campus jobs. On-campus jobs include such services as dormitory maintenance, clerical work, library or lab work, or accounting. Off-campus jobs will be related to the educational objectives of the student, or will be in the community interest.

I am also proud to note that New Hampshire has at least three neighborhood Youth Corps applications in process, and that the Phillips Exeter Academy, here in Exeter, is extremely interested in taking some part in antipoverty warfare. I imagine that New Hampshire soon will have fielded other poverty projects.

We have, of course, just begun to fight. And we must fight. Some of us may not like to face up to it, but poverty does exist in New Hampshire. We have it in considerable measure. Though we have a comparatively low rate of unemployment, over 7 percent of our 153,000 families have an income of less than $2,000 a year. This reflects severe poverty.

New Hampshire, of course, is not a State of large urban centers. Massive slum clearance therefore is not a measure that we contemplate. We must, however, do something about the tarpaper shacks that blight our landscape. There is one that stays in my mind particularly. You may have noticed it on the main road out of Hanover. It is a large, dilapidated tarpaper house. Its yard

is littered by unbelievable junk and debris, topped off by a piece of poverty sculpture which might once have been the family car.

Houses like these can be found all over our 10 counties. They are the grim symbols of poverty which signal that there is work to be done.

The work, as you know, has begun under the able direction of Charles Whittemore, director of the newly established New Hampshire Office of Economic Opportunity. Since late last January he has been busy analyzing the facts of our poverty which were assembled for him by Prof. James R. Bowring, of the University of New Hampshire.

According to his observations, New Hampshire's poverty is the result of underemployment, seasonal layoffs, shifting patterns of industry, and inadequate education. We expect to combat it on a town-by-town basis. Our projects will be supported by a $300,000 grant for community action from the Federal Government. For the first 2 years of a community program, I might point out, the Government pays 90 percent of the cost, and thereafter it is financed on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. Whittemore explained to me that a good deal of his time at the moment is taken up in conferences with our social agencies, our police departments, our boys' clubs, our visiting nurses, and our teachers. These are the specialists who have daily contact with our neighbors who are handicapped and depressed by poverty. Many of these people, I should imagine, will become key lieutenants in our New Hampshire poverty brigade. They will be working with leading citizens such as you in my audience who I know will enlist. And hopefully, all of you will work with representatives of the poor who really know what they are talking about.

I was moved by a story I read recently in a Washington newspaper, which underscores my suggestion that our community action groups work in cooperation with the poor. The story reported the graduation exercise of the first grass roots antipoverty training class in the District of Columbia. One of the graduates who spoke made the following remarks:

"I am one of the poverty striken—we're warm, lovable human beings—we have rosy dreams—but do not know how to get there. I know something can be done—we neighborhood workers are trained to find out the needs of our people—frankly, we are the people."

With young workers like these in the forefront of the fight, I am very optimistic about the future of our country's poor. But there is one final thing I would remind you of:

Our State, you will recall, was the first to declare its independence from Great Britain. I am confident that this same courageous spirit still runs strong in the fiber of our character, and that we will apply it to the tyranny of poverty wherever we find it.

SOIL CONSERVATION BETTER THAN RELIEF PROGRAMS FOR FARMER

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, our stewardship of land and water resources includes the requirement that we manage and protect these resources so their use for future generations will be enhanced and not impaired. We are obligated in our stewardship to pass these lands along in better condition than they came to us. People across the Nation are becoming increasingly concerned about proposed curtailment in some of our conservation programs suggested earlier this year by the administration.

The administration proposal to cut $20 million from the appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service and assess this amount against the individual farmers cooperating in the soil conservation program or the individual soil conservation districts is not justified at this time.

Farm income dropped off $300 million in 1964. Parity prices are at their lowest in 25 years. During the past 4 years farm debt increased from $26.2 billion to $38.3 billion, the highest in history. This hardly seems the time to ask the farm segment of our economy, which is definitely not sharing in our current economic progress, to pay more of the cost of soil conservation practices. If this administration program is allowed to go into being, much of our soil conservation work will be lost because many individual farmers and many of our soil conservation districts cannot at this time afford to contribute more funds needed for proper conservation programs. Both present and future generations will suffer if any program which tends to stop or even slow our soil conservation program is allowed to be established. This will affect not only our farm population but all of our Nation as well.

The total of displaced farm laborers, supplied by both the farm family and the hired workers from 1960 through 1964 was 947,000. This represents 26 percent of the persistently unemployed in the Nation. When we consider the fact that a considerable portion of this outmigration from the land has been rural people who are poorly prepared to work in our industrial and urban society, its effect on our attempts to reduce total unemployment, becomes doubly apparent.

In light of these facts, it is apparent that utilization of the full productive capacity of agriculture can contribute not only to our supply of food and fiber, but also to a lasting, affirmative solution to our unemployment problems. To achieve full utilization of our farm labor on the farms we need more, not less emphasis on land and water conservation practices and more, not less research into new uses for farm products as well as production and marketing. This means that programs such as soil conservation, agricultural research, extension services, reclamation, marketing research and various agricultural inspection services should not be shortchanged in favor of new socioeconomic programs aimed at wiping out unemployment and poverty.

Actually an investment in these agricultural programs will contribute more, dollar for dollar, in proven lasting benefits to keeping our population employed than will most of the new, untried programs that have captured the fancy of the planners these days. And more importantly, people working to produce food and fiber on the farms will have a much more wholesome effect on our economic and social progress than would these same people existing on costly relief programs.

The problems of rural America and of our total economy cannot be solved by substituting credit for earnings and relief for unemployment. Neither can they be solved by shifting programs such as soil conservation aside and then replace farm income with rural antipoverty programs.

My State of Idaho, through our State legislature, has spelled out in concise language the importance of the soil conservation program and their concern over any curtailment of it at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my remarks a copy of House Joint Memorial No. 8 passed recently by the Idaho Legislature urging Congress not to curb existing soil conservation programs by new funding methods that will require the farmer to assume more of the cost of these programs which benefit all Americans.

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

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the members of the senate and the house of representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 38th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that the Soil Conservation Service appropriation for assisting locally organized and locally managed soil conservation districts be reduced by $20 million and that soil conservation districts and cooperating farmers, ranchers, and other landowners 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 95 percent of Idaho privately owned land is included in its 54 soil conservation districts and nearly a third of Idaho'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 Idaho's 54 soil conservation 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, heavy sediment deposits in our reservoirs, lakes, streams, and rivers and spread over valuable bottom lands and other flood damages to both public and private property together with destruction or severe damage to thousands of water control and use structures, indicate a need for more, 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 Idaho and the Nation and fall harvest on family farms and small operators; and

Whereas this proposed additional burden added to the costs of farmers and ranchers already in a depressed economical 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 wise use of these soil and water resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to continue the long-established policy of providing technical assistance to soil conservation districts and their cooperating landowners and operators without requiring that they pay the Federal Government any portion of cost of such technical assistance; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress provide the increases in technical assistance requested by the soil conservation districts in Idaho 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 the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.
DRYDEN M. HILER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

JAYCEES INSPIRE CONGRESS

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, recently, we have had the pleasure of having in our midst, members of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. These young people, already leaders in their own community, did not come here to support or oppose particular legislation. Rather, they came here to learn more about their Government through conferences with leaders in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. I was pleased to note that these young people were not easily swayed by the presentations offered, but that they had open minds to assimulate the various ideas and information. They were appreciative of the time taken by Government representatives to address them. They quickly sought out Senators and Congressmen from their own State to discuss these conference subjects and to learn how the issues discussed affected their own States and communities as well as the national welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a portion of the remarks made by Senator DOMINICK to the U.S. Jaycees fourth annual Governmental Affairs Award banquet.

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

PARTIAL TEXT OF SENATOR DOMINICK'S REMARKS

The future of our way of life and the fate of freedom throughout the world can only be assured through the dedicated idealism and individual initiative exemplified by young men such as you. The Jaycee creed which emphasizes faith in God, brotherhood among all men, and the value of the individual, is the very bedrock of our free society.

A government can develop nothing that is not first created by its people. The great treasures of this world are found in the hearts and minds of men and human progress is possible so long as we work together toward preserving the dignity of the individual.

The scope of the problems you have tackled in your local communities clearly indicates your willingness and determination to have a voice in our Nation's destiny. Your work to preserve the free enterprise system, to maintain a government of laws rather than a government of men, and to serve humanity inspires all of us with confidence in America's future leadership.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, not only did these young people learn from Government officials, but we learned a great deal from the Jaycees and their wives. I had the pleasure of visiting at length with the three delegates from Idaho, Ron Porter of Boise, Vern Campbell of Emmett, and Emmett Wilkins of Kamiah, who drove through sleet and snow to save expenses so they could bring their wives. All of these young people from Idaho were willing to express their opinions on a variety of issues of great concern to them such as fiscal responsibility in government, reapportionment, taxes, education and care for needy senior citizens. These young people are not self-seeking. They are not looking for the easy way around our problems. They realize that we must do something to help the less fortunate help themselves. Most importantly, they understand that to succeed, representative government must have the support of its constituency. They firmly believe that local government can meet local problems best and most efficiently.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks the Jaycee creed.

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

THE JAYCEE CREED

We believe:
That faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life;
That the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations;
That economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise;
That government should be of laws rather than of men;
That earth's great treasure lies in human personality;
And that service to humanity is the best work of life.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the list of accomplishments of junior chambers of commerce across the country would fill many volumes. Nearly all of us at one time or another have seen and benefited from their community projects. One project which is attaining nationwide attention is the Jaycee's American Heritage Contest. With this project the Jaycees are seeking to make students increasingly aware of their heritage and obligations as citizens. In Idaho alone some 3,000 youngsters wrote essays for the contest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to include the essay of Idaho's 1965 contest winner, Miss Mary Alice Cook of Caldwell.

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

WHAT MY COUNTRY MEANS TO ME
(By Mary Alice Cook)

What a privilege it is to live in America, the land of the free. No other country on the face of the earth today offers so much for so many. Truly it is a land of choice above all others.

We have the freedom of religion, the freedom of speech, and the freedom of the press. I appreciate these freedoms more every day of my life.

The freedom of religion means that I have the right to worship how, where, or when I choose. I also have the freedom of not worshipping at all: in either case, it is my personal choice.

Freedom of the press gives me a sense of security knowing that I have the opportunity to read what I please and decide what is true for myself.

Freedom of speech allows me to speak as I think, in most cases, as long as I do not damage another person's good name.

I'm thankful for my forefathers who designed that Constitution and the brave men who gave their lives so that this country could be free.

I'm grateful for our system of education. At school I have the privilege of being taught by good teachers and associating with wonderful friends.

Protection is offered to me through good laws and the enforcement of those laws. The right to a trial by jury is one of the greatest privileges our citizens have. Every man is innocent until he is proven guilty.

When I become old enough, I will have the privilege to vote and choose whomever I wish to lead our country.

These are the main reasons that make me glad I live in this free land. I feel a great inner love for America and sometimes it is hard to explain how I feel. America to me is what a warm blanket is to a tiny baby. It means comfort and security. When I go to bed at night, I have no fear. I say my prayers. I arise in the morning to a warm house that is filled with love and the good things in life. I leave feeling secure and knowing full well that when I return all will be about the same.

My forefathers have left me a rich heritage. I pray that I may conduct my life so that I may always be worthy of being a citizen of the United States of America.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I congratulate Miss Cook for her victory and I congratulate all Jaycees for their outstanding efforts and leadership in this and other community endeavors.

GOLD PROBLEMS NEED ATTENTION

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, it is clearly evident that we cannot continue to drift and allow the steady and continual drain on our gold reserve that has been evident for some time and still be able to retain gold backing for our currency. World trade is increasing at a fast pace. Our military commitments to nations which are threatened by communism but wish to remain free cannot be reduced to any great extent overnight. There are still some nations that need and desire some economic assistance from us in cooperation with other Western nations. So, our ratio of gold to our world commitments and currency needs will fall lower and lower unless we take some positive action soon. Our monetary system is the envy of every nation

in the world. We need to keep gold as a part of our collateral for our monetary system. The price of gold has been frozen since 1934 while costs of nearly everything, including costs of mining gold have more than tripled since then. As a result our gold production has fallen off sharply. In 1934, we mined $108 million worth of gold from our domestic mines. Last year, 1964, we mined only $51 million worth.

Mr. President, since the beginning of recorded history the nation with the most gold has been considered the richest and the most powerful. We still have both the greatest supply of gold and the highest level of national economy of any nation in the world. We, however, need to find a way to encourage accelerated gold production if we are to retain gold as a part of our monetary system.

We have had no constructive leadership from the Treasury Department. They have been negative on every proposal that has been made. We need a study by a committee of Congress on the entire gold situation. I am pleased to cosponsor Senate Resolution 3 with Senator BARTLETT, to have such a study made so those of us in Congress can have the proper criteria that will be necessary to formulate a sound gold program. We cannot continue to do as the proverbial ostrich and keep our heads buried in the sand while our gold problems increase. We need to find sound solutions for these problems and possibly a study will give us the necessary information to work out satisfactory solutions.

GROUND BREAKING AT SUGAR GROVE, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 13, 1965, I had the pleasure of participating in a ground breaking ceremony for the new Naval Radio Receiving Station at Sugar Grove, in Pendleton County, W. Va.

West Virginia is most proud to be the home of this receiving station, and I am happy to have had a role in relocating this phase of the Navy's communications network to Sugar Grove. The area is a zone protected from radio interference by a statute adopted by the West Virginia Legislature.

The work of the Sugar Grove station and the plans that the Navy has for it were brought out clearly at the ceremony by Rear Adm. B. F. Roeder, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for Communications. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

ADMIRAL ROEDER'S REMARKS

Senator BYRD, Congressman STAGGERS, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed pleasant to be here and participate in this ground breaking for the Naval Radio Receiving Station Sugar Grove which has been a Navy dream for a long time. As many of you may know, the Navy has for several years been seeking a suitable site for a major radio receiving station to replace a similar facility at Cheltenham, Md., which is no longer adequate for this purpose because of electronic encroachment brought about by expanding Metropolitan Washington and increased operations at nearby Andrews AFB.

As you may know also, the original project for the construction of a radio telescope here at Sugar Grove was canceled in 1962 because major technological advances would permit achievement of same objectives by more economical means. When this project was canceled the Navy conducted intense studies to find other uses for the site here and the facilities already constructed. Our tests proved conclusively that Sugar Grove is an ideal receiving site markedly superior to Cheltenham and, further, that the national radio quiet zone protected by legislation enacted by the State of West Virginia will insure that our investment here will be protected against the situation which developed at Cheltenham. We could also use a major portion of the original facilities and recover a substantial portion of our original investment.

Accordingly, the Navy requested and was granted permission by the Secretary of Defense to relocate the naval radio facility from Cheltenham to Sugar Grove.

We might not be here today to witness this ceremony except for the invaluable support of Senator BYRD, who not only supported us but actually was successful in restoring the $3.8 million in the military construction authorization bill for the station after the project had been stricken from the fiscal year 1964 program. So I should like to express the Navy's appreciation to Senator BYRD for his keen interest and continued support of this project.

The major features of this project include the rehabilitation of the underground building, the construction of antennas of the latest types, installation of modern electronic equipment in the main building, erection of family quarters, and provision of recreational and support facilities. In addition to the receiving facility, certain activities of a research nature under the direction of the Naval Research Laboratory will continue at this site. These activities will in no way interfere with the operation of the receiving facilities.

The target date of January 1, 1966, has been established for this project to become operational. We shall try to adhere to the established schedule as closely as possible. Some slippage in some aspects may be expected, however.

For the first year's operation, we shall have between 60 and 75 persons attached to the activity. The level will be increased gradually until approximately 5 officers, 100 enlisted personnel, and 30 civilians will be attached by mid-1967. The current authorized ceiling is 6 officers, 110 enlisted personnel, and 37 civilian employees.

The total project here will involve the expenditure of $3.8 million. Of this, approximately $2 million will be expended for the main site facilities including the antenna systems. The support facilities including multipurpose building, the public works shop, recreational facilities, and water supply and distribution system will cost approximately $808,000. Twenty units of family housing costing approximately $314,000 round out the project. While the current ceiling for military and civilian personnel has been established as approximately 150, the support facilities have been designed to provide for an ultimate population of 200.

Finally, I should like to note that this Navy facility will bring into West Virginia an annual payroll in excess of $700,000.

HARRY BRICK

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in late February a very fine citizen of Washington, Mr. Harry Brick, died at the age of 80 years. It was the honor and pleasure of many of us in the Senate to know him—and I am glad that I had the fortune to know him for nearly 20 years.

He was a good citizen, a man of deep patriotism and faith, and his character inspired all who knew him.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an obituary notice which appeared in the Washington Post.

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

Harry Brick, 80, a Washington resident for 33 years and friend of several Senators, died yesterday in Georgetown University Hospital of complications following a heart attack and a stroke suffered a week ago.

Born in Poland, Mr. Brick attended schools in England before coming to the United States when he was 18. After living in Providence, R.I., he moved to Marianna, Fla., where he operated a dry goods store until 1932.

Since that time he had made his home in Washington, at 3616 Suitland Road SE. His wife, Gertrude, died in 1945.

He was a member of Adas Israel Congregation.

He leaves three sons, Dr. Irving B. and Albert of the home address and Dr. Edward J. of Northampton, Mass.; a sister, Gladys of New York City, and two grandchildren.

REPRESENTATION IN STATE LEGISLATURES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEARSON

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, since the U.S. Supreme Court first assumed jurisdiction in cases involving the apportionment of States in State legislatures, the issue of how these States should be apportioned has aroused a national debate which goes to the very heart of our system of representative government.

It seems to me that many of those who have participated in the debate on this issue, and particularly the one-man, one-vote concept which now is the guide for legislative representation have overlooked the real machinery of our unique governmental system. They have chosen to sacrifice the safeguards of the many minority interests which compose this Nation, in favor of a concept of representation which can permit unrestrained and possibly impulsive action to a majority, at the expense of those whom the founders of this Nation attempted so diligently to assure protection against being compromised.

This morning, I submitted to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments a statement in behalf of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. I request unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEARSON, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, IN SUPPORT OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 2, MARCH 18, 1965

In the course of the long debate over fair and adequate representation in State legislative bodies, many of those involved have, I am afraid, lost sight of the basic issue. Unless this controversy is returned to its

proper context the damage to our system of government will be great and far reaching.

I

Current attention to this problem is obviously the outgrowth of the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Baker* v. *Carr* in which the Court said that the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution supplied a sufficient basis for Federal courts to review allegations of malapportionment.

This case and subsequent cases reviewed by both State and Federal courts have been dramatized on the basis of an urban-rural conflict at the State legislative level. The tyranny of a rural minority dominating a helpless urban majority has stimulated emotional debates, petitions, proposals for State and National constitutional amendments, and restructuring of State legislative machinery. Those dramatics of the conflict do not represent the basic issue.

To some who seek to champion the so-called urban interest, the currently popular concept of one-man, one-vote espoused by the Court is the sweet fruit of victory. What a sorry mistake and what a great disservice these champions of a cause have imposed upon our system of government and upon those who they seek to protect.

II

Let me make it clear that I approach this problem with full appreciation that many legislative bodies have failed to adjust their composition to reflect a changing constituency. There is no doubt in my mind that in far too many instances there has been an absolute disregard for the structuring of representation to accommodate many legitimate criteria of a representative system of government.

To those who demand a return to the days before *Baker* v. *Carr*, I would remind them that our system of government was intended to be a representative system. It was not conceived to allow any minority to continuously frustrate the formulation of a concensus. On the other hand, it was purposely devised to avoid providing to any majority the capacity to use the machinery and power of government to exploit any minority.

To return to pre-*Baker* v. *Carr* would be to ignore these tenets. But I am compelled to point out the ridiculous situation in which we find ourselves now—bound under a mandatory one-man, one-vote rule—for it just as surely ignores these concepts.

Our system of government was also conceived to be a responsive system. It was designed to be intolerant of a governmental vacuum. Thus, with the consistent failure of other supposedly responsible authorities to act, the public's recourse to the courts should have been expected. The assumption of jurisdiction by the Federal courts should have come as no surprise.

III

The real issue in this entire debate revolves around one central question. How can we assure the existence of a governmental system in which there can be a full exercise of government when concensus demands, but which at the same time assures full consideration of the many diverse interests which make up this great Nation and that these interests, as minorities, will not be compromised? We seek a legislative composition which makes it possible to establish and implement a public policy when conditions warrant, but which assures caution and candor in the exercise of power.

I do not believe the application of the one-man, one-vote concept as the sole, the one and only, guide to legislative makeup in our representative system provides this assurance. I believe we must—by amendment of the U.S. Constitution, if necessary, allow the people of the individual States to apply other criteria to at least one house of their State legislatures.

This then is not a rural-urban issue. Time will prove that to try to dramatize it as an urban-rural issue, as it has been to date, is intemperate and temporary.

This is clearly a majority-minority issue and in this context this means that our system of government must adequately serve the majority while it protects the minority whether these be urban, rural, economic, geographic, racial, ethnic or religious.

The concept of one-man, one-vote seems an irrefutable concept when measured by our basic principle of majority rule.

The mechanics of constructing a government as a pure democracy in which the one-man, one-vote rule prevails is not difficult. It has been done by many nations in the past. But the genius of our system is that while the majority does in fact govern, the protection of the minority has not been ignored. The concept of the bicameral legislature wherein one house is apportioned on the basis of population and the other generally on the basis of area has proven to be the heart of the ingeniously devised system.

It is in preserving a system that provides the minority protection that the present rule laid down by the Court breaks down. It is in fostering the concept of absolute unrestrained majority control that the champions of one-man, one-vote in representative government have done a disservice to those they propose to represent.

IV

Those who contend that the majority of the populace is frustrated unless all legislative representation is based upon one-man, one-vote simply ignore the facts of our governmental structure, and the nature of our balances of both power and checks. The populace majority now elects statewide officers—the Governor and, in many States, numerous members of the Governor's cabinet. Through them this majority selects much of the administrative personnel and controls much of the machinery of State, county and city government. Where initiative and referendum are available, the populace majority has a clear and direct means of expression. Even in the courts the populace majority elect, or through their elected executive appoint, the members of the judiciary.

In those legislatures, such as Kansas, where one house has been traditionally elected on a population basis, the populace majority possesses the power to approve or reject any legislation. This power constitutes absolute control, especially when combined with the power of the majority as reflected in other aspects of the government as I have described.

Only in one house of the State legislature has representation of other interests been possible. To say that the desires of the populace majority are frustrated by this representation is naive. I predict the millennium will not be produced as expected under the present rule and at the same time the historic check which the system has provided will be aborted and a vital safeguard of minority interests will be destroyed.

V

There is, in my mind at least, a grave doubt that this great Union would have been as easily conceived if the method of representation continued through the years since its formation had been forbidden. The founders of this Union, in all probability, would never have conceded to the Federal Government, or the Federal courts, the right to dictate to a sovereign State the composition of its legislative body.

I suggest that a recollection of history of this Union and a study of the conditions of admission of the States thereto would reveal no basis for the form of rule now thrust upon us. Do you believe for a moment that this Union would have been formed when it was if, as a condition precedent to union, the Original Thirteen States had been required to remake their legislative bodies on the basis of the current concept of State legislative composition? What evidence is there of any request for admission of a State ever having been jeopardized by a challenge of the nature of the representativeness of its legislative body? Could, in fact, a State seeking admission, even under the current Court decision, be refused admission to the Union if its legislature was not apportioned on a one-man, one-vote basis?

Further, I wonder whether some States would have petitioned or accepted admission if legislative apportionment on the basis of the present rule had been a condition precedent.

The fact is that the State representative system of government which existed at the time our Union was formed and which has been accepted as suitable for the addition of States was based on a representative system conceived by the individual States as being best suited for their welfare. Their representative systems did not have to meet a Federal constitutional standard for admission to statehood.

VI

I contend that the individual character of the sovereign States is sufficiently different to justify the use of local discretion in formulating legislative composition.

In my own State of Kansas, for example, the State senate has been apportioned traditionally on a population basis. The house of representatives, by direction of the Kansas constitution, has been apportioned 1 seat to each of the 105 counties with 20 so-called "floating seats" assigned to the more populous counties. This system reflects the heavy reliance Kansas has placed upon county government for administrative purposes. The legislature has utilized special legislation for individual counties to supply them with the tools of government. Their spokesman in the legislature has therefore filled an essential liaison position between individual county administrative units and the State government.

In 1959, the legislature recognized the special problems peculiar to growing urban centers. It adopted and submitted to the people in 1960 a home rule constitutional amendment for cities. This amendment provides our urban centers with extremely broad power and reduces their reliance upon the State legislature.

Thus, in Kansas, the relationship between people and their governments at local and State levels places the State legislature in a position of dealing with a different set of issues than would be the case in some States where cities have no home rule or where counties are less significant units of government.

I believe the people of my State should have the opportunity to consider these conditions in devising a system of legislative representation. I am positive that other States can point to other conditions which provide circumstances not to be ignored in assuring effective, representative government.

VII

Finally, I want to emphasize that I recognize that if this issue is left exclusively to the entrenched interests in some States to adjust legislative situations to more nearly reflect present-day needs, it will either experience traditional procrastination or, if action is taken, it will be no more than a sham.

For this reason, I believe the courts must retain jurisdiction. But authority to apportion one house of State legislatures on a basis other than population must be authorized. However, I would not support such a constitutional amendment unless any resulting apportionment plans are subject to statewide referendum. Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 does contain this provision and

with it included I endorse the resolution and urge this subcommittee and the Congress to expedite its approval.

TRIBUTE TO CAPT. ALBERT HAROLD ROOKS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on May 15, a public park in Whitman County, in my home State of Washington, will be dedicated to the memory of a great war hero from Walla Walla, Wash., Capt. Albert Harold Rooks.

Captain Rooks' heroism is described in a letter I have received from Mr. Ken Brooks, chairman of the publicity committee of the Walla Walla Chamber of Commerce.

I submit Mr. Brooks' letter for printing in the RECORD, so that all Senators may learn of this action in honoring an American who gave his life for his country.

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

WALLA WALLA, WASH.,
March 9, 1965.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: On May 15, 1965, Walla Walla will dedicate a public park to the memory of Capt. Albert Harold Rooks, a hero of World War II. Captain Rooks was born December 29, 1891, in Whitman County, attended Walla Walla High School and graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1914.

In World War II his final command was the cruiser *Houston*. The *Houston* and the Australian cruiser *Perth* were damaged in the battle of Modoerma Straits and were attempting to make their escape at night along the coast of Java. The 2 ships were detected by the Japanese Fleet of 58 ships and the *Perth* was sunk at once.

Captain Rooks directed the uneven fight from the bridge of his ship, inspiring his crew by his courageous example. After being struck many times, the *Houston* went down on March 1, 1942, with her captain and over 500 others after inflicting severe damage to the enemy. Naval experts have declared the Battle of Java Sea to be one of the most gallant in all naval annals.

Captain Rooks was posthumously awarded this country's highest award, the Congressional Medal of Honor. And so, on May 15, this park near Walla Walla will be officially dedicated to the memory of Captain Rooks.

Very truly yours,

KEN BROOKS,
Chairman, Publicity Committee, Walla Walla Chamber of Commerce.

GENERAL DE GAULLE AND CONTINUING PRESSURE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the New York Times of yesterday there was a headline about Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, "Ball Says France Undermines Task of United States in Vietnam." The subheading was "He Decries De Gaulle Stand Against the War in Asia—Hanoi Gets Paris Credits."

There was also an article, from Paris, stating that France has agreed to give medium-term credits to North Vietnam.

The article adds that Nguyen Tu, general director of North Vietnamese Enterprises for Industrial Imports, states:

For the first time France had declared that she was ready to extend medium-term credits. He did not specify the terms, but economic circles said they believed the credits would run for 3 to 5 years.

The article adds:

The French Government clearly expects criticism from Washington and Saigon as a result of the deal. The attitude in some influential Gaullist circles is one of defiance rather than concern.

This Government of course is giving consideration to any proposal General de Gaulle brings forward for an honorable settlement in South Vietnam.

At the same time, it would seem unfortunate that the general believes it advisable for France to finance the North Vietnamese Communists in their aggression against South Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles in question be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1965]

BALL SAYS FRANCE UNDERMINES TASKS OF U.S. IN VIETNAM—HE DECRIES DE GAULLE STAND AGAINST THE WAR IN ASIA—HANOI GETS PARIS CREDITS

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, March 16.—Under Secretary of State George W. Ball suggested today that France was undermining the efforts of nations carrying the common burden of the free world.

In an allusion to the administration's dispute with the French about Western obligations in southeast Asia, Mr. Ball in effect called on them to contribute to the common effort or to stop pressing their views on others.

The Under Secretary's speech, made to a national foreign policy conference at the State Department, was a thinly veiled expression of the mounting irritation here with President de Gaulle's opposition to American military efforts in Vietnam and Laos.

Prominent officials not only are privately complaining of the lack of French support but also are charging that the French are attempting to undercut support for U.S. tactics.

ADVICE WITHOUT RESOURCES

"To play a useful and effective role on the world stage," Mr. Ball asserted, "it is not enough for a nation simply to offer advice on all aspects of world affairs. It should be prepared to back that advice with resources.

"If unwilling to do so, it does not contribute to the interests of the free world by seeking to impose its views on the nations that are carrying the common burden. In fact, when national positions are vigorously promoted without regard to their effect on the responsible common efforts of other states, free world interests may well be injured."

The administration has never set out in detail the French actions that it regards as objectionable. Presumably, officials have known of French plans, reported from Paris today, to extend economic credits to North Vietnam.

COMMITMENTS BACKED

Mr. Ball's speech was aimed at many abroad and in the United States who, he said, have been calling for a gradual American withdrawal from various parts of the world. He said that the U.S. economic and military involvement with Europe was irreversible, while American support for non-Communist nations elsewhere was essential to fill the power vacuum left by the collapse of colonialism.

He gave particular attention to the proponents of a resurgent nationalism in certain European circles who take advantage of the neoisolationism of others to injure the United States. That he meant the French was clear from his citation of a Gaullist phrase, "from the Atlantic to the Urals," to describe their long-range vision.

"If their own nations are to regain their prewar power and position in world affairs," he said of these Europeans, "their first tactical move must be to reduce U.S. power and influence. This means, among other things, weakening or dismantling the institutions and arrangements through which America and Europe cooperate."

The advocates of American withdrawal from other parts of the world, such as Vietnam, Mr. Ball added, "do not seem to understand that what we do in South Vietnam will have a profound meaning for people in the other outposts of freedom."

"Eventually," he said, "U.S. commitments can be reduced only if other Western nations resume their worldwide responsibilities." He said he did not expect this to happen until Europe became more unified and developed a whole new set of attitudes toward world affairs.

France has been insisting that the United States cannot solve the Vietnamese problem by military means and has recommended a gradual withdrawal arranged through an early conference. The United States has threatened to inflict ever greater punishment on North Vietnam until Hanoi indicates a willingness to discuss a settlement that leaves South Vietnam in non-Communist hands.

Mr. Ball was the first speaker at a 2-day briefing arranged by the State Department for representatives of nongovernmental organizations throughout the country. The other participants today, including Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, spoke for "background," meaning that they could not be quoted by reporters.

FRANCE TO EXTEND CREDIT

PARIS, March 16.—France has agreed to give medium-term credits to North Vietnam under a 1-year trade agreement.

Nguyen Tu, general director of Vietnamese enterprises for industrial imports, said he was also very pleased with the extension for another year of France's commercial and payments agreement with his country.

French sources considered the accord normal despite North Vietnam's sponsorship of the Communist forces fighting South Vietnamese and U.S. troops.

Mr. Tu said shortly before leaving for Hanoi that France and his country did about $4 million worth of business under the trade agreement in 1964. He said he hoped this figure would be increased for both exports and imports in 1965 under the new agreement.

France and North Vietnam maintain commercial missions in each other's capitals.

"To the extent that France can increase her purchases from North Vietnam, including coal, vegetable oils and artisans' products, we will be able to buy complete factory installations," the North Vietnam official reported.

He added that for the first time France had declared that she was ready to extend medium-term credits. He did not specify the terms, but economic circles said they believe the credits would run for 3 to 5 years.

North Vietnam, the official said, is interested in buying machine tools, other industrial equipment, heavy trucks and processing machinery, including paper mills.

The French Government clearly expects criticism from Washington and Saigon as a result of the deal. The attitude in some influential Gaullist circles is one of defiance rather than concern.

SENATOR GRUENING'S ANSWER ON RAMPART

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, if there is one proposition on which virtually all Alaskans agree, it is that our State needs very substantial economic development. Alaska came into the Union with the smallest population and the largest land area of any State. It still occupies the same position—at the top of the list of States in expanse, and at the bottom in number of people.

Putting those two circumstances together, it should be easy for everyone to understand that the level of economic development is low. It is particularly low in relation to the great resources of timber, minerals, land, marine life, and other wealth which exist there.

The one additional resource which many of us feel could make Alaska spring to life economically and channel all of these other resources into the national economy is hydroelectric power. The natural resources for that power exist in wonderful abundance in my State, but the harnessing of that power has hardly begun.

Alaskans are not unaccustomed to encountering obstacles in living and making their way on the last frontier. The obstacles are not physical only, but are economic and political, as well. One such obstacle, which we are certain we can overcome, is a rather profound ignorance of things Alaskan which persists in the minds of many of the citizens of the United States residing in what we fondly describe as "the lower 48."

Last week, the New York Times published an editorial entitled "World's Biggest Boondoggle." Under this unhappy and unlikely heading there appeared an attack on the proposed Rampart hydroelectric project on the Yukon River. My colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], has written to the New York Times, commenting on the editorial and taking issue with it. Earlier this week his letter was printed in the Times. I believe the letter deserves even wider circulation than that which was afforded by publication there. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, Senator GRUENING's letter to the Times.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1965]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES: GRUENING BACKS HYDROPOWER FOR RAMPART

To the EDITOR:

As your March 8 editorial on Rampart Dam refers to me by name as one who cheered a recently released Interior Department report, I hope you will give me an opportunity to comment.

The only possible explanation for your characterization of Rampart Dam as the "world's biggest boondoggle" is that the Times has not attempted to get the facts.

Would the Times have described Grand Coulee as a boondoggle? Or Boulder Dam? Or the Tennessee Valley Authority? Your disdainful dismissal of the importance to consumers of low-cost power from Rampart completely ignores advances in economic progress and standards of living accompanying successful development of hydropower for public benefit.

BENEFIT TO NATION

Not only Alaska, but the Nation as a whole will benefit from low-cost power from Rampart. The Federal Power Commission predicts that power needs of the American people in 1980 will be 2½ times the amount required in 1964. To meet this onrushing increase in demand, Rampart's 5 million kilowatts will supply less than 1 percent of the total. Although Rampart is big, it is also necessary.

Four years of intensive study by the Corps of Engineers and other agencies, public and private, have brought Rampart to the point where a definite report should be available later this year.

You refer to the analysis now being made by the Natural Resources Council. Why not wait before jumping to half-baked conclusions?

Your reference to Rampart as "the world's biggest sinkhole for public funds" ignores that all these great hydro projects are fully amortized, principal and interest, from the revenues for the power generated. The billion dollars which you italicize in your horror, is an investment which will be more than repaid, for in addition to repayment of funds advanced is the income from taxable industries and taxable employees.

The answer to the question of marketability of Rampart's power has been given not only by Development and Resources Corp., under supervision of the respected David Lilienthal in a study for the Corps of Engineers, and by private consultants, but now by the Department of the Interior. That answer is "Yes."

As to supposed superiority of alternative sources of power, the same studies lead to the same conclusion that Rampart power will be cheaper than nuclear energy, coal-fired steam plants, natural gas or oil or any other Alaskan hydro project. If resource conservation and low power costs are important, Rampart is incomparably better than the widespread destruction and excessive costs of suggested alternatives.

Construction of Rampart can be expected to result in significant increases in production of migratory fowl, fur-bearing animals and fish, as has happened at other projects. The Times estimates of losses of migratory fowl, animals and salmon appear to be those calculated by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. The people of Alaska have suffered too often from egregious errors of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Our once great salmon fishery resources declined so that in 1959, the last year of Fish and Wildlife Control, it had reached the lowest point in 60 years. Under State management the salmon runs have improved substantially, a difficult task after the Fish and Wildlife mismanagement.

GROUPS IN OPPOSITION

Again, the Fish and Wildlife Service, followed by the Wildlife Management Institute and the National Wildlife Federation, would have performed a grave disservice to Alaska when, in 1957, these groups opposed development of oil and gas resources of the Kenai Moose Range. Fortunately they did not succeed. These organizations then sounded alarms about the damage and destruction this would visit upon the moose, in the same vein as the cacophony now heard against Rampart.

When, over these protests, but with approval of the Izaak Walton League, the Moose Range was partially opened to leasing, the moose flourished. Far from damaging the habitat for moose, the incidental lumber clearing enhanced it.

Rampart will bring wildlife resource increases, and we rejoice that this can occur simultaneously with increased prosperity for the people of Alaska and the Nation.

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator From Alaska.

WASHINGTON, *March 12, 1965.*

NEGRO REGISTRATION AND VOTING IN SOUTH CAROLINA, AND THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Tuesday, March 16, edition of the Greenville, S.C., News contains an Associated Press article, datelined Columbia, S.C., which is particularly noteworthy at this time. The article deals with the available voter registration figures and the extent of the participation in the 1964 election of the registered voters in South Carolina. In addition, it deals with the probable effects which the voting-rights bill would have upon the voting qualifications in South Carolina.

Of particular interest, however, is the last paragraph of the article, which reads as follows:

The South Carolina voter education project, a Negro effort to get Negroes to register, told the Associated Press recently that the problem is to get Negroes interested enough to vote. The project is concentrating on a campaign to accomplish this. The project said that qualified voters are being registered in all counties in the State as far as it knows.

I want to bring this article to the attention of the Senate, in the hope that it will shed some light upon any questions which may exist concerning the State of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Mar. 16, 1965]

THORNTON DECLINES COMMENT ON JOHNSON VOTER REGISTRATION BILL

COLUMBIA.—South Carolina Secretary of State O. Frank Thornton declined comment Monday on the administration's new voter registration bill.

Federal officials active in getting the bill ready for Congress said South Carolina is one of six States in the South in which the bill might see State voter registration procedures bypassed in favor of Federal registrars and virtually no restrictions on registering.

Thornton said he would have no comment until he has seen a copy of the bill. His office is in charge of elections and voter registration in the State.

Federal officials said any State registering or voting fewer than 50 percent of its eligible age group would come under the bill. They said in 1964 South Carolina voted only 38 percent.

Thornton's records show that State had 772,748 voters registered for the 1964 election—the one used for the Federal figures—and that 524,748 voted. This broke previous voting records by a hundred thousand as the State went for Republican Presidential candidate Barry Goldwater.

The registration was in a total population of 2,382,594 by the 1960 census.

South Carolina's requirements for voting are residency—a year in the State, 6 months in the county—age 21, free of felony convictions and mental incompetency, and ability to read any section of the State constitution or own property assessed at $300.

The Federal bill would eliminate the literacy and property requirements if it was applied in South Carolina. And registration under the bill would apply to local and State elections as well as to Federal elections.

The Federal bill, according to its Washington spokesman, takes the position that if less

than 50 percent of a State's age-eligible citizens are registered or vote, then that State's citizens are being blocked from registering or voting.

The South Carolina voter education project, a Negro effort to get Negroes to register, told the Associated Press recently that the problem is to get Negroes interested enough to register to vote. The project is concentrating on a campaign to accomplish this. The project said that qualified voters are being registered in all counties in the State as far as it knows.

IMPORTATION OF MEN'S, BOYS', AND WOMEN'S GARMENTS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, letters which have been coming to me from Ohio manufacturers of men's, boys', and women's garments express fear of the adverse impact which the increased importation of foreign products will have upon their businesses.

For an example, I have in mind immediately a letter received from the Van Wert Manufacturing Co., of Van Wert, Ohio, expressing their belief that many small manufacturers will be forced to give up the "ghost" through the years, because of the increased importation of the type of goods which they manufacture.

Mr. W. H. Soldner, of the Van Wert Manufacturing Co., as the basis of increased fear of what will happen to these small manufacturers, cited the fact that the Blue Bell, Inc., of New York, has entered the volume price apparel importing field by forming the Globe Superior, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Blue Bell. This Globe Superior, Inc., newly formed, will intensify the importation and selling of wearing apparel for men, women, and children, to be placed upon the counters of American businesses, for sale in competition with goods manufactured within our own country.

The fear residing with Mr. W. H. Soldner, representing the Van Wert Manufacturing Co., is reflective of the general fear that prevails in this industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Mr. W. H. Soldner and the clipping out of an unidentified newspaper which he enclosed be printed in the RECORD.

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

VAN WERT, OHIO,
March 9, 1965.

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It occurred to us that you, as a legislator, might be interested in the information with its implications as revealed in the attached clipping.

Blue Bell, Inc., is one of the largest manufacturers, if not the largest manufacturer, of work and leisure clothing in the world. This company has caused many small manufacturers to give up the "ghost" through the years. Now in their greed they are closing in on still a greater portion of this type of business via Penney, Sears, Wards, et cetera.

Over the years we earned a living, and helped independent retailers, and gave employment to hundreds of good Ohioans, but we are having a very rough time of it now. We can't compete on price. We don't know the answer but we thought the information revealed in the clipping may interest you.

Thanks for the excellent job you are doing in the Senate.

Respectfully yours,
THE VAN WERT MANUFACTURING CO.,
W. H. SOLDNER.

BLUE BELL FORMS IMPORT COMPANY

NEW YORK.—Blue Bell, Inc., has entered the volume price apparel importing field with the formation of Globe Superior, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary.

The company will step up its drive in an extensive and intensive effort of importing and selling wearing apparel for men, women, and children, with Globe Superior functioning as an independent organization with its own executive, merchandising, and sales staffs.

It will operate independently of the parent corporation's own sales divisions. Headquarters are at 6 West 33d Street.

Ralph Grossman, formerly a vice president of Marlene Industries Corp., import division, and a member of its board of directors, is president of Globe Superior. Mr. Grossman was with Marlene for 10 years.

Globe Superior will import apparel from all over the world, with emphasis in all types of goods, men's, women's, and children's, according to Mr. Grossman. He added that a substantial part will come from Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Okinawa.

The company, Mr. Grossman said, will emphasize volume price merchandise, but with quality controls exercised. First lines will be for fall selling.

Blue Bell has previously imported apparel for the family under the name of Hillgate and under private labels for various customers, an official said, indicating that this activity will be continued.

RESOLUTION PROTESTING CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IN GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and a resolution protesting the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Grand Junction, Colo. The resolution was adopted by the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, and has been sent to me by the city clerk.

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

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION,
March 9, 1965.

The Honorable GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colo., at its regular meeting held February 17, 1965, passed and adopted the attached resolution protesting the closing of the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Grand Junction, Colo.

Very truly yours,
HELEN C. TOMLINSON,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colo.:

1. That the city council, by this resolution, express itself as being unequivocally opposed to the closing of the Veterans' Administration Hospital in the city of Grand Junction for the following reasons:

(a) Grand Junction is the center and economic hub of an area of the approximate size of the State of Ohio and is a logical and proper place for such facility, as the normal pattern of those to be served brings them to this point.

(b) The facilities in Denver and Salt Lake City are considerable distance from the veterans to be served, and adverse winter weather and mountainous terrain complicate travel to these remote facilities.

(c) The companion medical services, mentioned as a reason for closing the facility, are available in the city of Grand Junction.

(d) The closing of a practically new facility, constructed in 1949, seems indefensible.

2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to those individuals or officials who have the responsibility of determining the status of the facility.

Passed and adopted this 17th day of February 1965.

CHARLES E. MCCASSIUS,
President of the City Council.

Attest:

HELEN C. TOMLINSON,
City Clerk.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CONSOLIDATIONS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the problem of Veterans' Administration policy in attempting to close many VA administrative centers and hospitals is still very much before us.

As Members of this body know, Chairman TEAGUE, of Texas, is currently conducting hearings on this proposal in the House of Representatives committee.

Ray Asmussen, field officer and claims representative of the South Dakota Veterans Department, has written me concerning the high efficiency rating of the administrative center in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Because I am very proud of the excellent, efficient operation of the VA office in Sioux Falls, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Asmussen's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SOUTH DAKOTA VETERANS' DEPARTMENT,
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak., March 15, 1965.

HON. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: The claims activity has been increasing at the Sioux Falls regional office during the years of 1963, 1964 and during the months of January and February of 1965. This can be seen by the increasing number of original claims filed for service-connected disability compensation, non-service-connected disability pension, claims for death pension or indemnity compensation by veterans, widows, and other dependents of the deceased veteran. Also there is an increased number of claims for a burial allowance, eligibility determinations for loan guaranty benefits, civil service preference and educational benefits. The effectiveness of the claims division at Sioux Falls by VA standards has been consistently on an average of 100 percent. The award section of this regional office in Sioux Falls has been consistently 100 percent effective or better during the past 2 years and up to the present time. The effectiveness of the clerical operation has averaged over 150 percent. The direct labor effectiveness has been approximately 105 percent over the past 12 months, while that of the clerical and typing service has been 150 percent or better. The cost per standard man-hour for January and February of 1965 is $4.26.

Upon the basis of these facts the claims activity has been more than 100 percent based upon the standards established by the

VA in Washington. The Sioux Falls regional office is producing very well and effectively in spite of the Washington computer and VA central office knows it. Just why they continue to harp on the theme that the Sioux Falls office is not as effective as St. Paul is beyond me.

There are many original claims received from veterans who have had 20 years or more of service. These require considerable development. In claims for compensation for chronic conditions, such as a heart disability, it is necessary to formally review all military clinicals and other evidence of record before service connection can be established. On this type of case the VA allots an inadequate time standard and it does not compare to actual time spent on such cases. There are more notices of disagreement being filed which means a complete review of all records, including service records, VA physical examinations, all previous VA decisions, and all other evidence of record. A complete summary of such a review must be furnished the claimant. The VA in Washington allots approximately 5 hours by their standards in the preparation of such a summary and the interpretation of applicable rules, regulations, and laws. The time allotted is not sufficient for this report. Many such statements require 8 to 14 hours to prepare. Very few statements of the case require less than 8 hours. In many cases it is necessary to prepare two, three, and four supplemental statements and in such instances Washington does not allow any credit for the time spent in this preparation. These are some of the examples of inadequate standards established by VA central office. The VA's work measurement standards are unrealistic and are established on outmoded standards which lead to false conclusions. In spite of this the Sioux Falls VA regional office is effective and the service to the South Dakota veteran and his dependents is one of the best. The VA in Washington most certainly cannot say the larger VA centers throughout the United States can compare to the one in Sioux Falls and this includes the one in St. Paul, Minn.

Good judgment, fair interpretation of rules and regulations and the application of commonsense in decisions cannot be measured by any set standard. It is not a routine operation as VA officials would have you believe. Each veteran is entitled to the fullest consideration of his claim under the law. To do otherwise denies the veteran and his dependent of their legal right. Through the effort of all service representatives in this regional office and the very fine cooperation these service representatives have with the claims division I know the veterans of our State are receiving good and fair decisions on their claims which cannot be said of many offices throughout the country.

The claims division is the backbone of the Veterans' Administration, and all other VA divisions and especially service representatives work in close harmony with this division here in South Dakota in order that the end result will be fair and square treatment for all veterans. This is also true of the other divisions of the VA and it is, therefore, very important that this regional office remain in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. To remove this activity and merge it with one of the already larger offices will destroy this essential, fine service to the veteran and his dependent in South Dakota. The records will show the Sioux Falls office has consistently maintained high quality work which is among the very best in the country. Mr. Driver, Mr. Brickfield, and Mr. Farmer know this and should be able to answer that question. Their answer must be "yes" if they will only be fair in their judgment.

Upon the basis of all evidence of productivity and quality of the work of the Sioux Falls office, it is far superior to that of many other VA offices and that includes the one in St. Paul. This should be clearly understood by VA management personnel. When all the true facts are set forth about the efficiency of the regional office in Sioux Falls, it is quite obvious the merger with St. Paul would be foolish from the standpoint of cost and efficiency.

Very truly yours,

RAY ASMUSSEN,
Field Officer and Claims Representative, South Dakota Veterans Department, 2217 West 18th Street, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

BRACEROS VITAL TO CALIFORNIA CROPS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the San Diego Union, a newspaper whose circulation includes some of the richest farmlands in the Nation, an article on the necessity to California's economy of the importation of farm labor. As the article points out:

The alternative is rotting crops, a blow to the economy, more unemployment, and higher prices for food.

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:

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 13, 1965]

BRACEROS VITAL TO STATE CROPS

California may suffer a $500 million economic loss if farmers are not assured of a labor supply to harvest the ripening crops, the U.S. Senate has been told.

A growing number of experts, farmers, and officials, including Gov. Edmund G. Brown, are telling Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz that the domestic labor supply cannot and is not filling the agricultural labor needs. They can be met only through a bracero type of program, using foreign nationals in the fields.

In spite of the mounting evidence from authoritative sources, Mr. Wirtz remains adamant in his stand that domestic workers can fill the need.

Among the latest officials urging the Secretary of Labor to change his mind is Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the Senate majority leader.

The Labor Department's proposal to exclude foreign workers "is an experiment * * * which is going to bring about the ruin of a major industry," Senator MANSFIELD warned.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL told the Senate the total damage to California's economy will be between $500 and $700 million if foreign workers are not available for the fields. Senator MURPHY and the 14 California Republican Members of the House have long been champions of an extension of the bracero program.

If the workers are not available the direct damage will be to the $3.5 billion annual California farm output. Also threatened with economic loss are such California industries as trucking, food processing, the container industry including glass, metal, and plastic, and the printing and advertising trades.

The final victim will be the housewife, who will discover the adamant stand of the Labor Department will take more of her money for food.

California is only a part of the agricultural economy that is suffering from termination of the bracero program. Florida, for example, reports about $6 million worth of citrus has rotted and cane growers have lost $1.7 million because there was no help. Some dependent workers, like truckers, may have to go on relief.

If enough labor to harvest the California crops through September is to be obtained, the planning and agreements for an outside labor supply must begin now.

The alternative is rotting crops, a blow to the economy, more unemployment, and higher prices for food.

BRACEROS AND THE COST OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, my good and close friend and eloquent spokesman for our State's leading industry, agriculture—Mr. Leonard Finder—points out in an editorial the costs that consumers will pay because of the bracero blundering.

The Sacramento Union is the oldest daily newspaper west of the Rockies, and has always been in close touch with the problems of the great State of California.

I only hope that the Secretary of Labor will heed the warning, and will make braceros available, so that the farmers in my State may harvest and plan for the harvesting of their crops. Otherwise, I hope the Secretary is prepared to answer the complaints of consumers when the prices of agricultural products increase this year.

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:

[From the Sacramento Union, Mar. 12, 1965]

COST OF BRACERO BLUNDERING

Estimates are beginning to come in as to what the badly bungled bracero program will cost the consumer, emphasizing that the ultimate burden of the mistakes of dictatorial bureaucracy always must be borne in the end by the taxpayers.

Reports from the Salinas area is that the winter planting of lettuce is at the lowest point in nearly a score of years—because of growers' concern about ability to harvest their crop. Only 11,130 acres were so planted this year, compared with over 13,000 last year, and more than 16,500 in 1963.

In the past, only about 20 percent of the workers have come from domestic sources. More than 16,000 braceros were employed last year in stoop labor.

With Mexican pickers barred, harvest costs will rise markedly. The farmers' uncertainties are compounded by the scandal of the false figures about available farm labor emanating from State offices.

Based on the limited planting, estimates are that spring lettuce likely will be priced about double last year. And that is only part of the cost, for the same result will apply to many other food products—such as tomatoes, where over 100,000 acres less than 1964 are being used this year.

Apart from this part of the bill to the consumer, there are the other aspects: the losses incurred by the farmers, exodus of some growers to Mexico, impact upon food processors, packers and freighting companies, loss of tax income to the State, and depreciated real estate values.

It's time that citizens should become equally concerned about the inordinately high cost of willful, autocratic government that is more interested in theories than realities, in placating political allies than serving the common well-being.

Each governmental mistake affects far more than the immediate victims. Each act of indifference or stupidity causes far-reaching reverberations that hurts every individual and undermines public confidence and the foundations of our very society.

DE GAULLE FACES BACKFIRE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, over the past decade, Eliot Janeway, of New York, has built a nationwide reputation as an economist, especially in the field of world affairs and the international monetary situation.

I should like to call to the attention of other Senators an article by Mr. Janeway which appeared in the Washington Evening Star and other newspapers, across the country, on Monday, March 8, 1965. In the article he makes the point—

De Gaulle has got so carried away by his anti-American show of strength against the dollar that he has jeopardized the supply of francs needed to pay for the bread ration.

Mr. Janeway also writes that De Gaulle is—

raising dollars to pay out for our gold by imposing a credit moratorium on his own economy.

And he further points out:

The only way De Gaulle has been able to get the Communists to go along with him has been to go along with the money demands of the unions the Communists control. Hence France's fearsome rate of domestic inflation.

Because I believe Mr. Janeway's article is the most lucid exposition of the perilous financial ploy on which President de Gaulle has embarked, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. I hope all Senators will find the time to read it.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 8, 1965]

AS JANEWAY VIEWS IT: DE GAULLE FACES BACKFIRE

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—Wherever U.S. businessmen meet today, their first and overriding concern is for the gold outflow, which results from the dollar payments deficit. People are asking whether this means we're in for trouble in our own backyard, and why French President de Gaulle is challenging our own financial stability, by his decision to turn in his dollars for our gold. This determined effort to siphon off some of our gold has led an articulate cross section of American opinion to jump to the conclusion that France is strong and the United States is weak.

A quick look at the internal balance of power in France is enough to show that this is a topsy-turvy view of reality. De Gaulle has been fighting a rearguard action, unsuccessful up to this point, against an inflationary domestic cost push. Part of his domestic power base, for example, rests on France's backward farm setup. To appease his protectionist farm bloc, he has been forced to subsidize uneconomic crop production at an increased rate.

WEAKNESS MARKED

De Gaulle's weakness on the labor front is even more marked. There, he is exposed to a swollen army of government employees. In France, the importance of the governmental sector of the economy, relative to the private sector is much greater than here including, as it does, for example, the railroad workers. This means that the fiscal base in France is much narrower than in the United States.

Moreover, the inflationary impact of the labor cost push is much more powerful there than here—and tougher to deal with, too. There's a very special reason why. The left-wing tradition of French labor, and of French professional life is capped by a very strong Communist Party.

Admittedly, the French Communist Party has never been noted for its discipline. But, then, neither has the Italian Communist Party. And it is universally admitted that the Communist-paced labor cost push in Italy has brought that formerly expansive economy to the verge of bankruptcy and the edge of political instability.

ALL TANGLED UP

A country in which a Communist Party gains an important foothold is always vulnerable to political instability and to financial insolvency, or to both. As a practical matter, the only way De Gaulle has been able to get the Communists to go along with him has been to go along with the money demands of the unions the Communists control. Hence France's fearsome rate of domestic inflation. Like the Romans with their bread and circuses, he's fed francs to the work force and put on a show of baiting Uncle Sam.

Recently, however, while we've been worrying about whether we're financially weak and France sound, De Gaulle has got all tangled up in his own feet. In order to support his publicized power play against the dollar, he's dried up the money supply at the French banks which are on a de facto dollar standard. The way he's raising the dollars to pay out for our gold is by imposing a credit moratorium on his own economy. Just about the only bills French business can pay today are for the weekly payroll. Consequently, De Gaulle's run on our gold has run the French economy out of gas.

Classicist that he is, De Gaulle will do well to remember that the Roman version of the phrase gave bread a priority over circuses. De Gaulle has got so carried away by his anti-American show of strength against the dollar that he's jeopardized the supply of francs needed to pay out the bread ration. The French Communists won't let him get away with saying: "Let them eat gold." As they begin to put the squeeze on De Gaulle to call off the credit famine at home, American business will find our own boom more impressive than his challenge to it.

THE NATION HAS BENEFITED FROM LESSONS LEARNED IN THE GREAT ALASKA EARTHQUAKE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, 9 days from today, we shall mark the first anniversary of the great Alaska earthquake. It is, therefore, fitting that at this time I express the gratitude of all Alaskans for the generous and sincere assistance given our young State by the Federal Government in the confused days which followed March 27, 1964.

The extraordinary efforts of both military and civilian departments of the executive in responding to one of the most severe earthquakes ever recorded, together with the careful consideration and early enactment by Congress of a Federal relief bill for Alaska, belied the often heard pronouncement that big government is incapable of effective response to situations requiring prompt action. These acts will long stand as examples of the best in American government.

However, Mr. President, this afternoon, rather than catalog all that has been done for Alaska, I wish to tell the Senate something of what the Nation has learned from Alaska's experience.

All of us here in the Senate, Mr. President, know that we and our successors shall see natural disasters occur in our States in the years to come. The fact that this is inevitable and the fact that existing legislation is at present inadequate to fulfill the responsibilities of the Federal Government when disaster strikes were recognized by the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska.

This unique institution, an arm of the executive, headed by one of the most distinguished Members of the Senate, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] was charged initially with coordinating the reconstruction and the development of Alaska's post-earthquake economy. At the conclusion of its monumental task the Commission issued a final report, dated September of last year. The report, entitled "Response to Disaster," on pages 38, 39, and 40 presents a series of long-range recommendations to minimize destruction and loss of life in future earthquakes, both in Alaska and elsewhere. Because the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is the sort of man he is, these recommendations have a universality which makes them applicable to natural disasters of all kinds.

They consist of a series of suggested technical studies aimed at learning more about earthquakes, their nature and predictability, the susceptibility to earthquakes of certain geologic formations, and the kinds of precautions which can be taken to minimize, through changed construction techniques, future earthquake damage. Consideration of the merits of Federal disaster insurance is advocated. In addition, amendments to Public Law 81–875, the Federal Disaster Act, are suggested. All of these recommendations are designed to make more effective the Federal Government's response to possible future natural disasters.

Being curious about what the administration had done to follow through on the recommendations of the Anderson Commission, I recently wrote to the President, asking him for a report. Soon thereafter I received a reply, the contents of which I should like to share with the Senate.

It appears that, after reviewing the Anderson Commission recommendations, the President immediately referred the technical recommendations to the Office of Science and Technology; the disaster insurance recommendations, to the Housing and Home Finance Agency; and the recommendations for study and improvement in Public Law 81–875, to the Office of Emergency Planning.

How prompt was the action taken by the administration can be seen in the following paragraphs from the reply sent me by Lawrence F. O'Brien, Special Assistant to the President:

A preliminary review of the scientific proposals by the Director of OST (Office of Science and Technology has already resulted in the inclusion in the President's 1966 budget of requests for $600,000 for the establishment of an Alaska sea wave warning system by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, $100,000 for new earthquake prediction

research by the Survey, and $1,500,000 to enable the Coast and Geodetic Survey and Geological Survey to conduct earthquake hazard and other engineering and geological studies of the type mentioned by the Federal Reconstruction Commission. Included in the latter amount are funds for updating seismic-risk maps, studies of the geological and geophysical history and behavior of the San Andreas fault system, studies of submarine landslides, and the Prince William Sound and Montague Island areas, and studies of the nature and stability of submarine slopes in southeast Alaska. Additional studies are continuing by the special OST Panel on Earthquake Prediction.

Related work is also underway in the Department of Defense. For example, the Advanced Research Projects Agency is conducting programs aimed at developing improved seismic instrumentation, and the Corps of Engineers is working on improvements in the design of military construction to make facilities more resistant to earthquakes. Various technical reports on the Alaska earthquake are also being prepared.

As for the Anderson Commission suggestions for further study of the feasibility of a Federal disaster insurance program, it appears that the administration is waiting for Congress to enact Senate bill 408. This bill, already unanimously passed by the Senate, is now under consideration by the House. If acted upon favorably there, the Housing and Home Finance Agency is prepared to seek the required appropriation. Nine months thereafter, the Senate should have a report by the HHFA on the cost of a Federal flood and hurricane-transported water insurance program. Within 3 years of the appropriation, we should have a report on the cost of an earthquake insurance program.

It may be that a carefully documented study by the HHFA will be all that the insurance industry requires in order to set up reasonably priced flood damage, hurricane-water-damage and earthquake-damage insurance; or it may be that a congressionally initiated program will have to go into effect for a few years before the merit of insuring for these uncertain risks can be demonstrated to private industry. Such was precisely what happened with hail insurance in the 1930's, so the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] told us at the time when Senate bill 408 was acted upon by the Senate.

As for the Anderson Commission recommendations for improvement of the Federal Disaster Act, Mr. O'Brien informs me that the Office of Emergency Planning, now headed by an able public servant, Gov. Buford Ellington, is engaged in a three-part study. Initially, Federal experience in administering the provisions of Public Law 81–875 is being examined, in order to determine how the Federal Government can more effectively respond to major natural disasters. This study will extend to both the public and the private sectors of the economy. Second, the OEP is studying techniques for anticipating and planning in advance for disasters, so as to minimize their adverse effects. Third, Federal-aid policies for program assistance in hazardous areas are being reviewed.

This study has not as yet resulted in any recommendations for legislation; but, having worked with the dedicated staff of the Office of Emergency Planning in the grim days following the Alaska earthquake of last March 27, I am convinced that their study will produce some valuable legislative ideas for the President's consideration.

In passing the Federal Disaster Act in 1950, Congress abandoned its previous policy of handling each new major disaster with special remedial legislation. A new policy—of delegating responsibility in this area to the President—evolved. It is, therefore, appropriate that we look to the President for recommendations as to how the provisions of Public Law 81–875 can be improved.

The fact there is room for improvement is perhaps best illustrated by considering the similarity between the Alaska bill of last year and the west coast flood bill of this year. When almost identical legislation has to be passed by Congress in order to alleviate the effects of two such dissimilar disasters as the 1964 Alaska earthquake and the 1964–65 west coast floods, is it not time to consider whether general legislation of this type is justified?

As the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has recently stated:

> How much better it would be to have on the books disaster authorization which would permit the President, within limits, to allocate funds for required undertakings in the repair of Federal or federally aided structures and for loans where there is widespread damage to private property.

The sooner we have such legislation, Mr. President, the more effective will be the Federal response to disaster. No longer will it be necessary for Congress periodically to be disturbed by quickly drafted, incompletely studied—but manifestly necessary, under the circumstances—legislation such as last summer's Alaska earthquake legislation and the proposal for relief of west coast flood-disaster victims presently before Congress.

JUVENILE CRIME

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, President Johnson's message on law enforcement and the administration of justice emphasized the pressing demands for dealing with the problems of our youth, for no country can hope to be better than its young people. In their hands lies the future of our democracy. Today, most young Americans are making significant contributions to our society. They know more about a wider variety of subjects than has any previous generation. Yet, despite this fact, juvenile delinquency and youth crime have been increasing alarmingly in the last few years.

All of us know that too many of our young people are dropouts. Half of all children today in the fifth grade will not finish high school. Too many of our young people leave school before they have completed the education which they must have in order to compete for jobs in our increasingly complex and competitive society. We know that too many of them are unemployed, are roaming the streets, are becoming addicted to drugs, are being drawn into illegal operations, or are simply stirring up trouble, because they have nothing better to do. We have recognized this problem, and have instituted programs of training and placement to bring more young people back into the mainstream of productive society; but the problem remains a mammoth one.

The President has set the scene for renewed and expanded efforts against crime and delinquency. In recognizing that crime and delinquency are truly national problems, President Johnson is provided leadership toward increased national cooperation in investigating the causes of youth crime; in developing methods of eliminating the causes; and in strengthening the ways in which we deal with the crime and delinquency which we have not been able to prevent. The President pointed out several in which the need for prompt action is particularly relevant to the disturbing incidence of delinquency: Regulation of the mail-order business in firearms; control of the dissemination of psychotoxic drugs; measures to combat the narcotics traffic, and to rehabilitate those who have fallen into the trap of addiction. The Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, which the President has said he will soon establish, will no doubt uncover additional means of preventing delinquency.

The task is a very large and very difficult one. It will tax our patience, our imagination, and our ingenuity. But it is a task which we must undertake, and at which we must succeed. As President Johnson said on Monday, the human costs of crime cannot be measured. And surely no price is too high to pay for the reclamation of our youth, tomorrow's leaders of our country and the world.

GROWING INTEREST IN MARINE EXPLORATION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in February, I introduced a bill, S. 1091, which would provide a program for marine exploration and development of resources on the Continental Shelf; and I was joined in this effort by Senators from numerous coastal States, including Oregon, California, and Hawaii, on the Pacific coast; and Texas, on the gulf coast; and Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Rhode Island, Maine, Connecticut, North Carolina, and New Jersey, on the Atlantic coast. I have been very much encouraged by the favorable reception given to this proposal and by the deep interest that has been indicated on the part of those in Government and in private industry.

In my opinion, one of the most impressive statements of the need for marine exploration and development was made recently by Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., Chief of the Science Policy Research Division in the Library of Congress. Dr. Wenk has a small but extremely well qualified staff of scientists who are doing an outstanding job in providing Congress with the support needed in scientific policy matters such as those involved in Senate bill 1091. This statement was made

before the American Society of Civil Engineers, in New York City, and is entitled "Engineering for Marine Exploration and Development."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this excellent statement be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

ENGINEERING FOR MARINE EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

The term "ocean engineering" has recently suggested an exciting new facet of oceanography. To some, this activity refers to the engineering of instruments, manned spar buoys, deep-diving submarines, mechanical arms, advanced navigation systems, radio-linked buoys, and other paraphernalia now sought by oceanographers to replace more primitive tools for research. To others, ocean engineering refers to the technology of exploiting the oceans for practical purposes—for undersea warfare and sea-based deterrents, location and development of petroleum and natural gas reserves in deep water, extraction of manganese nodules from the ocean floor, and advancement of fisheries from the hunting-collecting stage to a new mode of aquaculture.

There is, however, another level for engineering consideration—namely, one concerned with public policy—with setting requirements for ocean engineering in contrast to the implementation of these requirements. What follows is mainly the development of a new conceptual framework of exploration in which we may identify the newly emerging challenges for ocean engineering.

A CONCEPT OF EXPLORATION

As our national oceanographic program has grown and matured, we have thought of the attack on ignorance about the oceans primarily as science. Such inquiry provides the critical brick-by-brick foundation for comprehensive understanding of the ocean world around us. But while this is a necessary condition for meeting this Nation's expectations and destiny in the oceans, the scientific approach alone may not be sufficient. An alternative approach is to consider this endeavor as one of exploration, in fact, two complementary and overlapping modes of exploration: scientific and geographic. Exploitation of maritime resources may follow either.

Although seldom mentioned in relation to modern oceanography, geographical exploration is one of the most vital qualities of our Nation's history. Only a short two centuries ago, man knew as little about this continent as he knows about the oceans today. Spurred by nationalistic desires for territorial expansion, by the promise of virgin resources, by the desire for freedom, or simply by the challenge of the frontier, man pushed into the wilderness. Only knowing that the unknown lay ahead, the freewheeling adventurer, the mountain man, the explorer, and the pioneer sought to observe, to describe, later to map and settle a new territory. This pattern was repeated on a different scale in this century with exploration of the North Pole, and the South Pole. Now we reach for the moon.

Science when considered as a species of exploration has much in common with geographic exploration—in its motivation by human curiosity, in its systematic search for facts about the world around us. There is a further similarity in the historic source of sponsorship: Government has almost always been the patron of geographical exploration; in this century, and in all nations, government has become the patron of science. But there are major differences between the geographic and the scientific mode of exploration that merit examination as a basis for establishing national purposes and priorities, especially as a backdrop for considering the peaceful uses of the ocean for man's benefit.

To consider goals for ocean exploration—scientific and geographic—and engineering strategies for their achievement, we must first set the stage with answers to such elementary questions as:

What is oceanography?

How does understanding of the oceans benefit man?

What are this Nation's present goals and plans?

How is this program funded and organized?

What are our future opportunities?

What are our barriers to progress?

SCIENTIFIC EXPLORATION

Every schoolboy learns that the sea covers more than 70 percent of the earth's surface. Observations over the centuries, and recent scientific measurements have provided us with a crude description of the Continental Shelf, of the major plateaus, underwater mountain ranges, and crevasses. We now chart major currents like the Gulf Stream and deep countercurrents. We have observed that the sea sustains marine life in great abundance, surprisingly distributed from Equator to pole, from surface to abyssal depth.

Oceanography is the scientific study of these elements of the earth covered with sea water. Yet, it would be erroneous to think of oceanography, however, as a universal science or as one science. Rather, it is an aggregate of all the sciences—physics, chemistry, biology, geology, etc. For in fact, the laws of nature regarding matter, molecular combinations or living tissue, hold everywhere. Here, the sea itself is the laboratory.

In this context the scientist seeks answers about the earth and about the nature of life itself. Buried in sediments under the oceans lies the geologic history of the planet: evidence as to its origin the birth of continents, and the evolution of life in the sea. Because the sea contains fish and plants of prodigious variety and in highly specialized forms, unique opportunities unfold at one scale to study tissue, muscle, nerve fibers, and, at the macro scale, to study the ecology conducive to thriving fish population.

PRACTICAL BENEFITS

Motivation for study of the sea arises from more than scientific curiosity. From our Nation's infancy, the sea was a path toward new frontiers. It has acted both as a buffer against aggression and as a medium of transfer of merchandise and culture between nations.

Knowledge of the sea surface and its relationship to wind and weather is an obvious practical aid to navigation, for both safety and improved reliability of ship operations. We should recall that it was this user requirement for knowledge of winds and currents in the days of sail that first sparked this Nation's oceanographic research. To gain supremacy as a maritime power, with clipper ships that could outsail all competition, this Nation became a leader in oceanography. Parenthetically, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, organized in 1807, was the first Federal scientific-engineering agency of any kind.

As a military arena, the concealing cloak of the seas assumed yet a third dimension with the introduction of submarine warfare. And with the application of nuclear power that permits long underwater endurance, we have deployed Polaris, a virtually nonpreemptable deterrent.

It has been said that undersea warfare is a deadly game of blind man's buff in which the winning side is most likely to be that with the most acute hearing. Temperature gradients, layers of plankton which scatter sound and the noise of the sea itself challenge our attempts to make the ocean transparent to underwater surveillance on the one hand, and to exploit its cloak of concealment on the other.

Today we seek to improve weather prediction from a better understanding of the interaction between atmosphere and ocean, in recognition that solar radiation, largely falling on the oceans, energizes weather and climate.

Commercial fishermen bring home a worldwide catch of 55 million tons. Yet of 20,000 known species of fish, only a few are used as food. It has been conservatively estimated that an annual catch 4 to 5 times this size could be sustained infinitely without threatening fishery stocks. With the tyranny of hunger still gripping so many of the world's population, it becomes vital to identify environmental factors which influence distribution and abundance of fish, and prudent steps to develop these resources.

There are other practical benefits. Magnesium and bromine in sea water; petroleum, natural gas, coal and phosphates on or below the ocean bed have already been exploited. But an enormous supply of minerals remains—largely uncharted but available for development when the drain on the world's continental reserves make ocean exploitation attractive.

Finally, the seashore yields succulent shellfish, affords sport fishing and swimming, and the therapy of simply watching the endless sea. U.S. citizens now spend $500 million annually for salt water fishing; $2½ billion for sport boating. On the other hand, man has regarded the sea as an infinite pit for the disposal of garbage. Knowledge is required to satisfy these conflicting needs in the face of growing, urbanized populations.

FEDERAL GOALS AND LONG-RANGE PLANS

Recognizing this potential to contribute to a host of public interests, Federal legislation evolved beginning with establishment of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Many other elements have since been added. Yet, in 1959, a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences, noting the lag of oceanography behind sister fields of science, urged that Federal expenditures of about $32 million annually be increased over a 10-year interval to roughly $80 million per year.

Almost immediately, congressional leaders enthusiastically endorsed this program. Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON and Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER introduced a number of resolutions and bills expressing congressional determination to establish national policy and to strengthen and expand the program. In 1960, the House Science and Astronautics Committee released a report indicating that expansion in support to $160 million annually was not unreasonable. By no means is support of oceanography a partisan issue. Republican Members of both Houses have recorded their views on the importance of advancing this Nation's understanding.

In 1959, the executive branch began to increase funding and took steps toward better coordination. President Kennedy added decisive impetus by his $100 million budget proposals to the Congress in March 1961, and President Johnson reasserted this intent to support oceanography when transmitting fiscal proposals for 1965.

Because no other sources of funding or leadership have emerged, meeting this opportunity has become a Federal responsibility. The Federal Council for Science and Technology, a "science cabinet" charged by the President with Government-wide planning and coordination, issued a policy paper in June 1963 outlining a 10-year plan for Federal oceanography, the first of its kind for any field. By 1972, the Council estimated annual expenditures would grow to $350 million.

Most significant for purposes of this present discussion is the Council's statement of goals—that the Federal Government was sponsoring a program "to comprehend the world ocean, its boundaries, its properties, and its processes, and to exploit this comprehension in the public interest, in enhancement of our security, our culture, our international posture, and our economic growth." In the context of this present paper, it is important to note that this national goal of making scientific knowledge useful to mankind anticipates a significant engineering function that has not yet matured.

PRESENT FUNDING AND ORGANIZATION

Under this stimulation, Federal funding for oceanography has steadily increased. For fiscal year 1965, it amounts to roughly $135 million—for the conduct of research, ship operations, the training of new staff, and the construction of additional ships and shoreside facilities. Not included is a substantial amount of classified, applied research associated with military security. Also not included is a small amount of funds from private foundations and from State governments. Private geophysical exploration by the petroleum industry, a largely unpublicized component of our Nation's oceanographic capability, invests at least $200 million annually for exploratory drilling. Incidentally, the U.S. Government estimates an income from offshore leases and royalties of $250 million; twice the total Federal investment in research.

Whether this level of support is adequate has increasingly been the subject of discussion in policy circles, partly stimulated by comparisons with funding for space exploration, partly by awareness that Federal budgets for oceanography have leveled off over the past 3 years, and partly because industries whose growth has been spurred by Federal expenditures for military and space research and development are now seeking other markets.

As noted later, only a few individuals in the fishing industry which has much to benefit from oceanography have urged increased expenditures, and these proposals have been relatively modest. Very little encouragement has been heard from industrial leaders catering to the civilian sector of our economy.

Excluding the private geophysical exploration for oil, the Nation's program is thus 90 percent federally funded. But fully half of this is privately performed, mainly in university and nonprofit laboratories. This funding is itself highly decentralized; on the basis of statutory missions, some 20 Federal agencies are engaged in both basic and applied research:

Navy maintains freedom of the seas through national defense.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is concerned with improving the commercial catch.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife seeks to develop recreational fishing resources.

Coast and Geodetic Survey charts of bottom topography, currents, temperature, gravity, and magnetic fields to assure uninterrupted, safe navigation.

Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines study the location, richness, and industrial potential of mineral resources.

Weather Bureau collects data related to weather prediction and understanding of atmospheric processes.

Atomic Energy Commission determines conditions for safe disposal at sea of low-level radioactive waste.

Public Health Service is concerned with the purity of foods from the sea and effects of marine organisms on human health.

Coast Guard protects life and property at sea considering storm and iceberg hazards.

Army Corps of Engineers studies damaging effects of waves on coastal property and means for correction or abatement.

NSF and Smithsonian develop scientific knowledge not otherwise sponsored in relation to specialized agency missions, and necessary research resources of manpower and facilities.

State Department considers the potential of oceanography to contribute to foreign policy, to foster international cooperation through scientific expeditions and data exchange, assesses implications of the oceans in foreign technical assistance and is responsible for developing a U.S. position on international law.

Since statutory authority for this diversity of missions existed before deliberate acceleration of this program, the executive branch has sought to expand and strengthen this program in the context of existing legislation, rather than through new legislation or concentration of responsibility in one agency, existing or newly formed. Toward this end, the Federal Council charged its Interagency Committee on Oceanography (ICO) in 1959 with assessing both scientific and mission-related goals, and with planning a coordinated program on a Government-wide basis. Such plans, categorized by agency budget and functional component, are now annually transmitted to the Congress.

SOME CONGRESSIONAL CONCERNS

The Congress, recalling the frequent ineffectiveness of interagency committees to set targets and evolve a program that is more than a simple superposition of the parts, was initially skeptical of this approach. But in 1963–64, the executive branch contended and the Congress has acknowledged that this coordinating mechanism has somehow or other transcended the limitations of Federal departmental structure and debilitating interagency rivalries.

In recent years, the Congress has become less and less satisfied. Always aware that funding is a valuable index of priorities, they have been puzzled by the leveling off of oceanographic expenditures and simultaneously aware of the search by a vigorous research and development industry for new markets. Because it is not the dominant responsibility of any operating agency, applied oceanography must compete within agencies against other programs, and no policy has been established by the White House to protect these oceanographic budgets. In its probe of symptoms as a prelude to diagnosis, a number of bills were introduced by the 88th Congress expressing further intent to strengthen the program. Three suggest a remedy by changes in executive organization. H.R. 6997, reported out favorably by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and passed by the House, called for a comprehensive long-range and coordinated national program to be implemented by balanced participation and cooperation of all qualified persons, institutions, organizations, and agencies or corporate entities whether Government, educational, nonprofit, or industrial. The bill requested that the President utilize the Office of Science and Technology in planning and conduct of the program, issue a statement of goals and an annual report setting forth the status of federally sponsored research by function and by agency, and that he appoint an advisory committee of non-Government scientists to review the program. This proposal was supported by the executive branch but it did not pass the Senate.

S. 2990 introduced by Senator MAGNUSON would go further—by establishing a cabinet level National Oceanographic Council patterned after the National Aeronautics and Space Council, composed of the Vice President who would be Chairman and a number of departmental secretaries and agency heads. Charged with advising and assisting the President in performing functions in oceanography, the Oceanographic Council would presumably be more effective than ICO because of its higher level representation. In addition, the Council would be assisted by a full-time staff.

In a more comprehensive proposal, Congressman BOB WILSON introduced H.R. 10904 to establish a new National Oceanographic Agency that would coordinate a "national program for oceanography and related sciences including meteorology" with a transfer to the new agency of "all functions related to oceanography and related sciences which are vested—in any department, agency, and instrumentality of the United States" provided, however, that "no function would be transferred under this act which the President determines will not be transferred in the interest of security."

While none of these legislative proposals passed both Houses of Congress, they reflect a concern as to whether long-run needs and opportunities require a program that is more than a projection of the existing parts, with full-time Government-wide leadership.

FUTURE GROWTH AND REQUIREMENTS

Interest in new legislation by those outside of Government has been expressed primarily by oceanographers who participate in the program and by the research and development industry, increasingly apprehensive about future prospects. Both sectors feel that the program is still not growing fast enough. For example, in its recent assessment, the National Security Industrial Association proposed that the level of support grow this year to roughly $900 million.

Comparisons between these proposals, the National Academy of Sciences' Congressional and Federal Council projections is confused by lack of definition as to what is legitimately, if arbitrarily, embraced within the scope of this federally sponsored program. At the present time, for example, the Mohole project, having the objective of geological sampling through a hole in the ocean floor 3 miles deep, is termed research in the earth sciences rather than in oceanography. Regardless of definition, the growth is not as great as many people, including nonoceanographic scientists believe.

Perhaps it has been inadvertantly oversold by its enthusiasts. Federal budgets for the conduct of far less publicized astronomical research are larger than for basic oceanography.

This leads to the thorny question of how fast should the program expand. Some have advocated sharp, immediate growth on the basis of unmet needs for sophisticated engineering tools for research. The ability to meet requirements is not, however, a reason to set requirements.

To establish criteria for future growth, it is illuminating to separate scientific exploration from other applied goals. Otherwise, a serious problem arises from considering the entire national oceanographic program as science. First, it would seem larger than it really is. Of the $135 million fiscal year 1965 obligations, only half were for the conduct of research, but only one quarter for basic science. When trying to establish a balance between scientific fields, this bookkeeping has been a source of serious misunderstanding, especially by other scientists.

Strengthening basic science is well understood as a major goal of this program. Past experience with nuclear weapons and space systems has amply demonstrated that our national welfare critically depends upon the quality, scope and vigor of our scientific base. Future applications of this knowledge may be only dimly foreseen, but it has become a de facto national policy to invest in both scientific results and research resources to meet the unforeseen. This long-term investment is a form of risk capital of the Nation.

At what rate should the Nation invest in scientific exploration? There has been widespread agreement both by the scientific community and by policymakers that the rate of expenditures should be based on the availability of skilled scientific manpower. It

was because this base was too small that the executive branch initially accelerated its support. The manpower base has now doubled, and the Nation for the first time now has a growing fleet of modern, efficient ships tailor-made for oceanographic research rather than converted from hulls intended for other purposes. Because of the inevitable lag between appropriations and accomplishments, fruits of this investment will not be realized for several more years.

If, in fact, this base has matured to match that of other fields of science not so poorly endowed, then Federal support of the basic research component of scientific exploration could match the 15 percent or so growth per year that characterizes Federal support of science as a whole. Additional operating costs as new ships join the fleet also need accommodation.

Annual support for applied research and development in the oceans may grow at a somewhat different rate, either more or less, than that for basic science. This rate depends upon the assessment by policy makers as to the potential of such projects to contribute to explicit goals in the public interest, considering and in competition with all other demands for public funds. More than half of this directed research is currently devoted to national defense, and the rate at which it expands must be weighed in terms of the Navy's role in our defense structure and the need for information to assure achievement of our defense objectives. Development of new capabilities for search, rescue, and salvage as an aftermath of the *Thresher* disaster, is one major new activity in this area. Navy spokesmen now also refer more often to the need for research so as to operate at greater depths.

The case for the nonmilitary sector, however, deserves special analysis. In its long-range plan, the Federal Council indicated that whereas the Navy sponsored 48 percent of the Federal program in fiscal year 1964, its share even with continued growth would be only 32 percent in 1972. In other words, along with growth in basic science, the Council advanced arguments for strengthening support to meet nonmilitary goals:

1. The development and intelligent conservation of biological and mineral resources.
2. Protection of the ocean environment against accidental pollution.
3. Accelerated collection of oceanic data related to meteorology.
4. Technical assistance to newly developing nations, especially those suffering protein deficiency.
5. Development of international law related to rights of ownership, transit, fishing and conservation.
6. Protection of property and safety of life on or in proximity to the sea.
7. Protection and enrichment of seashore recreational resources.
8. Assistance to industrial components such as the fishing and shipping, offshore oil and sea mining industries.

As indicated previously, the rate of investment in applied research and development in these areas depends primarily upon anticipated economic or social benefits. The net momentum of the overall program thus depends on the other hand upon the forces of science-generated knowledge awaiting application, and on the other, upon the suction of the potential users of knowledge. The initiative for assessment of economic benefits has historically resided in the private sector. It is reasonably clear from the lack of more intense activity on its own, or requests to the executive and the Congress for Federal support, that private industry has not felt compelled to urge sharp acceleration in applied research.

Unless private interests in oceanic resources generate more strenuous requirements, it is difficult to foresee more rapid advance of applied oceanic activities other than in areas of military security—except for one major consideration: a decision by this Nation to embark on a publicly sponsored program of geographical exploration.

GEOGRAPHICAL EXPLORATION AND MARITIME DEVELOPMENT

What is meant by geographical exploration and does it differ conceptually from present scientific exploration? First, geographical exploration is more concerned with answering the questions of "what," "where" and "when." Scientific exploration is more concerned with answering the questions "why" and "how." Second, geographical exploration may be approached more from a strategic point of view, whereas science, by and large, is approached from a tactical, problem-oriented point of view. In so distinguishing by no means should one imply that there is a hierarchal relationship between these two endeavors. Moreover, the two approaches should closely interact. Geographic exploration should be guided by cues signaled by scientific knowledge. And we would expect to use many of the same instruments for geographical exploration as are employed for scientific. But maritime exploration and its implied evolution to maritime development is much more akin to practices employed by petroleum companies in their search for offshore oil and gas reserve, rather than by the marine geologists in seeking a site for Mohole or for cores that may reveal the history of the earth.

The great epics of continental exploration are largely behind us. History records the adventures of Lief Erickson, who in A.D. 1000 sailed to the Western Hemisphere; of Marco Polo in travels to China; of Christopher Columbus; of Magallen in 1520 circumnavigating the globe; of Champlain and Hudson who explored North America around 1603–7; of Cook, rounding Cape Horn to discover the South Seas and Hawaii; of Lewis and Clark who in 1804 explored the Louisiana territory purchased under President Jefferson at 4 cents per acre. In this century, we have seen Perry at the North Pole in 1909 and Amundson at the South Pole in 1911. The corresponding quest in the sea is in its infancy.

While motivation for these expeditions differed, and consequent exploitation of discovery differed, they were nevertheless oriented more toward the goal of geographical exploration than toward sicence.

Improving our ability to describe the oceans and its contents was one of the major elements of 1959 proposals by the National Academy of Sciences when they urged sharply accelerated programs of oceanwide survey. These proposals visualized a systematic crisscrossing of all of the world's oceans on a 10- or 20-mile gridwork, with instrumented ships that would permit the compilation of ocean atlases.

This original concept engendered much debate within the scientific community. Many oceanographers felt that the wholesale if not random collection of data would be wasteful; with limited funds, efforts should be far more concentrated on specific problems. Recent testimony before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee indicates that the Federal response to the NAS survey proposals is beginning to evolve, but that detailed plans for long-range guidance are yet to be formulated. In some measure, the absence of explicit plans suggests the absence of determination as to whether there should even be such a survey program.

Perhaps some of this controversy and confusion arises because surveys have been justified and planned primarily in relation to science. To be sure, the Indian Ocean and tropical Atlantic expeditions blend dual objectives. But these are of limited scope and duration. It is difficult to find proposals that surveys be conducted in a broader framework of geographical exploration, planned in terms of subfields in geography, such as physical geography, biogeography, and economic geography, rather than subfields of science; i.e., physics, chemistry, and biology. It is possible to consider an attack on our geographical ignorance of the ocean in terms of the classical disciplines, as subjects of science. But it is also possible to plan such surveys in term of objects of science; that is, to locate and develop fish and mineral resources, protect and improve seashore resources, improve surface and possibly submarine transport, and to construct a more rational base for establishment of international law of the sea.

When we consider the immense investment necessary to map all the oceans in detail, even within one lifetime, priorities will surely be needed. To establish priorities for surveys as between different fields of science is exceedingly difficult. Approached as a problem in geography, choices can be made on the basis of anticipated economic and social returns. With even elementary cost benefit analysis, regions of the world warranting initial exploration could be identified—as for example the continental shelves, an area becoming all the more significant as recent international conventions regarding development of the Continental Shelf, and practice in deeper water extends sovereignty of nations and their engineering operations beyond the water's edge. The recent frenzy of gas and oil exploration in the North Sea is a current example.

The Lewis and Clark Expedition was not conducted by a comprehensive traverse. Rather, they followed the obvious water courses and mountain ridges. Detail was filled in later by geodetic surveys. Settlement occurred with a variety of incentives, including the device of land grants. In the case of ocean exploration, these water courses may be topographic, but they also may be political or economic or scientific. For as geography rather than science, a determined attack on oceanic ignorance assumes that in the systematic collection of physical facts, there is continuously introduced in the planning process an interpretation of these physical facts in relation to the public interest. Such attention anticipates then a cultural element of the underwater landscape in terms of temporary if not permanent occupation of the sea and the seabed.

Contemporary technology, imaginatively employed, and enriched by engineering research, can convert this vision of many to reality. Indeed the development of such a capability is itself a potent instrument in relation to the conduct of one phase of foreign policy.

The law of the sea has been conscientiously accepted as a code of international behavior. But changes in rights of sovereignty, transit and conservation must be contemplated and increasingly based on scientific technical considerations. When, for example, multiple uses of the seashore conflict as between recreation, sport fishing, commercial fishing, oil exploration, and waste disposal, wise decisions by Federal, State, and international bodies must extend beyond the status quo and be based on a better knowledge of the environment and of the consequences of man's influence on it. Whether it be for fishing or mineral rights or the occupation of strategically located sea mounts for defense, observations based on systematic exploration and especially the capability for exploration will set the stage and provide the base of negotiation for future international agreements.

INDUSTRIAL PARTNERSHIP

When the economic incentives for exploration are ripe, American entrepreneurship has shown no lack of initiative. But when economic benefits are marginal or long deferred, and important goals in the national interest remain, only the Federal Government can assume leadership. Nevertheless, in this

country resources development following exploration will be more likely private than public. In the case of maritime exploration, it may well be necessary to consider new types of institutional arrangements between Government and industry that will foster a partnership in risk taking that neither alone could justify. The Communications Satellite Corp. represents one mode of development in a very special set of circumstances. Other modes can be visualized, linking Government with existing nonprofit institutions and with resource as well as research and development industrial components. This industrial participation must be expected to be more than simply providing engineering services and equipment for scientific exploration. It is the exploitation of these ocean resources that will integrate all the best contributions this Nation can offer.

POLICY ISSUES

This leads to the last point: the question of "whether." Whether this Nation undertakes a program of maritime exploration and development in addition to scientific exploration and applied research is not a question only of science policy; it is a question of public policy. The executive and legislative branches have complementary responsibilities in this regard. Ultimately, public policy develops out of a consensus of the American people: the Congress becomes the mirror of that consensus.

To answer the question of whether, policymakers must consider alternative, competing demands for Federal funds. For there are inevitably more attractive things to do in science and technology than there are funds for their pursuit. The Nation is increasingly recognizing problems at home as well as abroad deserving of its interest and its support. At the same time, however, the Nation, through a consensus expressed in the Congress, has boldly and courageously recognized that understanding the world around us is intrinsically a part of survival, much less scientific curiosity. We are embarking on major programs in space exploration motivated by security considerations, but this is also a reflection of man's challenge by the unknown.

With the bathyscaphe *Trieste* having negotiated 35,800-foot dives into the deepest trench, the research submarines *Alvin* and *Aluminaut* soon to operate, with successful Flip-manned spar buoys, monthlong habitation in submerged stations, the engineering feasibility of exploration under the sea as well as over it is now clear. But before we design nuts and bolts, the instruments, telemetering devices and computers, talents and experience of engineers, scientists, economists and others must be sought to establish as well as respond to requirements. In the context of the civil engineering profession there is obvious relevance of mapping, construction, sanitary engineering, waterways and harbors, soil mechanics, engineering mechanics. Almost every one of the 14 ASCE technical divisions is potentially involved. When seeking answers to questions of whether this Nation should embark on a program of exploration—geographic and scientific—on how fast and with how much money, engineering knowledge, and advice will be necessary.

CONCLUSIONS

The unrealized potential of the sea to contribute to our national interest has become widely understood: in terms of sea-based deterrents for national security; fish protein for undernourished peoples; minerals and fossil fuels to supplement continental reserves; expanded seashore recreational resources; the use of oceanic data to improve weather forecasting; and the use of the ocean as a laboratory for scientific research concerning the world around us.

Federal leadership has accelerated this comprehension of the ocean. U.S. superiority in both size and quality of oceanographic effort has been sustained. New attention has been accorded the recent leveling off of Federal funding for oceanographic research, the failure of certain program components to grow beyond a "subcritical size," inadequate collaboration between industry, science and Government. Also recognizing the unfilled nutritional needs of the world's population that could be partially met by more effective fishing, and the growing utilization of seaside resources, there has been increasing interest on the part of both the executive and the legislative branches to examine the potential of the oceans.

With the scientific base now strengthened, and with the engineering capability now advanced in the form of instruments and devices for observation and operation in the sea, it is probable that a new policy look will be taken as to goals, as to resources and as to organization.

In short, there is a new way of thinking about such goals in terms of three elements—scientific exploration, geographic exploration, and maritime development. A Federal program pursued as exploration could engender high intellectual excitement, contribute data that might well provide opportunities for this Nation to exploit resources near its shores, and eventually submarine resources at great depth. Such a program could stimulate other nations to develop their Continental Shelf resources, and open fresh opportunities for U.S. investment abroad.

In considering where the Nation goes from here, the engineer, industrialist, scientist, economist, and the policymaker will have much reason to explore this problem together. Here is the role of ocean engineering in its noblest sense—blending together science and economics, commerce and Government—to implement whatever future decisions may be made for the oceans to serve mankind.

GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD COLD WAR VETERANS; GOVERNMENT SPENDS MONEY TO EDUCATE CUBAN REFUGEES AND POVERTY PROGRAM DROPOUTS, BUT NOT OUR VETERANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, of the many Americans who fail to receive a fair shake in life, whether because of economic, social, or physical reasons, the cold war veteran is the only person who is penalized by his own Government. Our cold war veteran is used by the Government for from 2 to 4 years to defend the very foundations upon which that Government exists, and then is thrust back into society, with a total lack of concern on the Government's part.

On the other hand, our Government takes great care to see that some people who do not have a fair shake in life are given aid and assistance. During this fiscal year, we shall spend more than $42 million to aid the Cuban refugees, and the budget calls for $33 million next year. I may add that these programs include educational grants—a privilege which is denied to the cold war veteran.

Under the poverty program, we shall spend $700 million this year, with $1.3 billion scheduled in the budget for next year. Much of this money is also put into training and educational assistance—again, a privilege which is denied to our cold war veteran.

Mr. President, I am most proud of our Government's effort to help those who are denied a fair shake in life; I consider it essential to provide opportunity for everyone. But—and I cannot emphasize this strongly enough—I think the time has come when we must view in the right perspective our investments in this area.

The highest estimate of cost for the first year of the cold war GI bill has been $289 million; and that estimate was made by the Bureau of the Budget, a Government agency which has expended tremendous effort to defeat this bill. Yet, even at that cost, it would be a worthwhile investment which would be repaid many times over by educated veterans.

How this Government can continue to use our young soldiers at the most formative period in their lives, and then turn its back on their educational needs, while spending much more money, proportionately, for other groups, escapes my understanding.

The cold war veteran has assumed his responsibility; and I think it is high time that the Government reappraise its views and assume its responsibility.

To illustrate the hope which these young men are placing in their Government, I request that a letter received from Laurence A. Smith, Jr., presently in the U.S. Air Force, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

662D RADAR SQUADRON (SAGE)
(ADC), U.S. AIR FORCE, OAKDALE
ARMY INSTALLATION,
Oakdale, Pa., March 1, 1965.

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

DEAR SIR: I am taking this opportunity to write lending my support and comments for your Senate bill 9, extension of GI bill educational benefits.

I am now in a position where, upon completing my active duty, in the near future, I look forward to enrollment in a college or university. Although I believe I am qualified to complete college studies, attendance at this time would be impossible. I, like many others in the military who believe we can offer our services toward building a greater posterity, will be denied a higher education because of the lack of needed funds.

Today's common misconception is that everyone's parents can afford to send their sons to college. Those high school graduates of 17 to 18 years greedily look forward to attending college while their parents may at times struggle to obtain adequate financial aid. Today's society does not realize our parents are under no social or moral obligation to send us to college. Their only obligation is to raise us to manhood. When we attain the age of 21 years we are then in our own care and must assume adult responsibilities.

The only young adults in America today who realize their responsibilities are those who volunteered their services to their country during these cold war times.

Upon being discharged after 4 years active service, we find ourselves over 21 years of age and must take on the financial burden of college if we wish to attend. We know what is expected of our abilities and talents. Because we have worked in the field under conditions others do not understand, we more fully appreciate the value of a college education. Your bill, S. 9, can help those who unselfishly served their country to attend college.

It is the most important way a grateful country can say "thanks" for a job well done. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

LAURENCE A. SMITH, Jr.,
Airman, First Class, USAF,
Radar Maintenance Crew Chief.

APPOINTMENT OF MRS. EMILY H. WOMACH

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, much has been said in this Chamber and in the halls of the executive branch of our Government of the status of women in professional positions.

It is my pleasure today to commend to the Senate an article, in yesterday morning's Baltimore Sun, which announced the appointment of Mrs. Emily H. Womach, of Laurel, Del., as chairman of the Delmarva poultry industry's fund drive for 1965. Mrs. Womach is the first woman so named. Her background, as outlined is the article, has made her well qualified to hold the position.

I salute the Delaware-Maryland-Virginia poultry industry for its farsighted policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the Baltimore Sun of Wednesday, March 17, printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 17, 1965]

DELMARVA'S POULTRYMEN ELECT FIRST WOMAN TO POST

The Delmarva area's best known woman banker, Mrs. Emily H. Womach, of Laurel, Del., has been named chairman of the Delmarva poultry industry's fund drive for 1965. She is the first woman ever named to the post.

Her appointment was announced by William R. Murray, of Frankford, Del., president of the association which represents the Delmarva Peninsula's $180 million a year poultry industry.

Mrs. Womach, who is assistant vice president and secretary of the Sussex Trust Co., at Laurel, is a member of the Delaware State Bank Advisory Board, the first woman to be appointed to this board by a Governor of Delaware.

BANKING ACTIVITY

She is a former president of the National Association of Bank Women, a member and former chairman of the public relations committee of the Delaware Bankers Association, a past president of the Sussex chapter of the American Institute of Banking, and is active in the work of the American Bankers Association.

Mrs. Womach has long been active in poultry industry activities and is one of two women ever named to serve on the industry association's board.

She is the author of a pamphlet, "Bank Financing of the Broiler Industry in Sussex County—A Survey in Depth," which has been widely quoted in many of the nation's financial journals.

Last year Sussex County (Delaware) growers produced a record 108 million chickens to hold on to its claim as the Nation's leading poultry county.

The Delmarva Peninsula as a whole produces almost 1 billion pounds of poultry meat a year or about 1 of every 8.5 young, meat-type chickens grown in the United States. The association has 5,280 members, including growers, processors, feedmen, and other industry suppliers.

"MAKE PUBLIC INFORMATION PUBLIC"

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, history has shown that the successful functioning of a democratic system of government requires the fullest possible participation by informed citizens. Free governments have been subverted by force, it is true; but they also have collapsed simply because they were not enthusiastically supported by an informed electorate.

The only way we can have an interested and informed citizenry in this country is to invite the public to share in the information, the deliberations, and the decisions of government, every step of the way.

We must have in our system of government the greatest possible freedom of information, limited only by the rare restrictions needed in order to protect national security and the legal rights of individuals.

For the most part, this is an old, established American tradition. However, there constantly arise situations in which some misguided official—perhaps in all sincerity—decides that the public should not know what is going on in our Government. We need legislation to control such situations.

In the State of Wisconsin, we enacted a law, in 1959, which opens the doors to all public meetings and opens access to all governmental records, except in a few carefully specified instances, such as jury deliberations, real estate negotiations, and personnel matters in which public disclosure would injure the State's interest or would deprive a citizen of his rights. All State agencies and State records in Wisconsin are public, under this law, unless it can be clearly shown that there is some legal basis for secrecy.

This concept is now included in what is known as the proposed Federal public records law, introduced in both Houses of Congress. I am proud to be one of the cosponsors of that bill.

The Green Bay Press-Gazette, at Green Bay, Wis., recently published an excellent editorial commenting on that bill; and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that all Senators and Representatives may profit by reading it.

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

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette, Feb. 24, 1965]

MAKE PUBLIC INFORMATION PUBLIC

Bills have been introduced in both Houses of Congress to establish a Federal public records law. The proposed law would require every agency of the Federal Government to "make all its records promptly available to any person" and would empower Federal courts to order production of agency records improperly withheld.

The measures were proposed by Senator LONG of Missouri and Representative Moss, of California, both longtime supporters of the public's right to know what its Government is doing. More than 25 other Senators and Representatives have introduced companion bills or have cosponsored the Long-Moss legislation, including Wisconsin's Senators NELSON and PROXMIRE and Milwaukee's Representative REUSS. A similar law proposed by Senator LONG of Missouri was adopted by the Senate last year but got bogged down in the House Judiciary Committee when Chairman CELLER, of New York, ignored it.

The public records law is obviously and properly directed at the apparent belief of Government agencies that the public just doesn't have a right to know what they're doing. The dodge often is used that information sought by the public is classified, that is, secret, and would jeopardize the proper functioning of Government. In other words, it is the sole responsibility of the bureaucrats to determine what the public should or should not know. Presumably, the ordinary citizen can't be hurt by what he doesn't know. On the other hand, the less he's told, the less he will effectively be able to gage whether the agencies are doing a good job.

The public records law as proposed does make some exceptions to the general rule of open records. Excluded are documents dealing with such matters as defense and foreign policy, personnel matters, and investigatory files compiled for law enforcement. These exemptions perhaps can be justified. But the principal thrust of the proposed law is to prohibit the secrecy in which many agencies of the Government operate. Enforcement of the law is provided through the Federal courts where the agency would have to prove its right to withhold specific records from the public. The courts would have the right to punish agency officials for contempt if they refuse to disclose the records. The law presumes the right of individuals to see the records, not the right, as under present circumstances, of the agency to refuse to disclose them.

Senator LONG of Missouri's bill was thoroughly discussed at extensive public hearings last year. It had strong support of representatives of the legal profession and of newspapers, especially the latter which have the primary duty of gathering and transmitting information about Government to the public which otherwise cannot practically obtain it. In connection with the proposed Federal legislation, it is proper again to note that Wisconsin's antisecrecy law, while not perfect, has been of considerable value in eliminating many, if not all, of the secret sessions during which public officials made decisions.

The Federal public records law by Senator LONG of Missouri and Representative Moss should be adopted so that the activities and decisions of the Federal agencies will be open to the full scrutiny of citizens who, in their collective wisdom, then would be better able to evaluate whether such agencies are responsive to their wishes and needs.

JOSEPH P. ADAMS AND THE GROWTH OF LOCAL SERVICE AIR CARRIERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a very interesting article entitled "Taking Off" appears in the March issue of Aviation, under the byline of William V. Henzey.

The article deals with the amazing growth of the local-service air carriers in the United States. Mention is made of Joseph P. Adams, retired Marine Corps general, former member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and now executive director of the Association of Local Transport Airlines. In this connection, I am glad to note here a personal belief that General Adams is one of the most competent and best informed men in the aviation industry. His service to the

local carriers has been of a particularly high order.

In the belief that Mr. Henzey's article will be of wide interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the American Aviation magazine, March 1965]

TAKING OFF

(By William V. Henzey)

The major airlines of the United States and the world are moving ahead so fast in terms of traffic, service, revenues, and profits that some phenomenal accomplishments by smaller carriers are often overlooked. Not one to let them be overlooked for long, however, is Joseph P. Adams, Washington, D.C., aviation attorney and executive director of the Association of Local Transport Airlines.

Each January, ALTA conducts a congressional appreciation luncheon, an affair obviously named because ALTA appreciates Congress. And the highlight of each such occasion is a rapid-fire rundown by Adams of achievements by individual member carriers. We borrowed the notes used by Adams for this year's event because the facts involved tell quite a story.

For example, Alaska Coastal-Ellis Airlines, an all-amphibious operator which is finally about to have a land base at Sitka, carried 120,000 passengers last year in a service area of only 40,000 people. And do you know the U.S. airline with the highest load factor for 4 straight years? It is Aloha Airlines which last year posted a 1964 record of 63.8 percent.

Then there is Allegheny Airlines, whose 1964 results indicate why some local service airlines are now considered in the regional trunk category. It carried 1.25 million passengers, led the local industry in freight and charter revenues, took a half-million-dollar cut in subsidy, but returned a profit.

Bonanza Airlines, first with an all-jet-powered fleet (F–27's with DC–9's on order) had the highest load factor among local service airlines. And are you aware that little Caribbean-Atlantic Airlines (Caribair) last year was the second largest U.S. flag carrier in number of passengers carried?

Brother Adams' comment on Lake Central was self-explanatory: "The Nords are coming." And his reference to North Central provides a dramatic illustration of growth: "Its 1 millionth passenger was carried 7 years after it began service; its 5 millionth, 5 years later; and its 10 millionth, 3½ years later."

There are service superlatives, too. Piedmont, for example, provides at least two round-trips for every city on its system and has a system average of eight flights per station per day. No new routes last year, but Piedmont had a 24-percent increase in passenger miles. And how about conducting a subsidy-free operation over a route containing such behemoths of traffic generation as Attu, Shemya, Amchitka, Adak, Atka, Umnak, and the Pribilofs, as Reeve Aleutian Airways does in Alaska?

There were many more such facts, including Southern's first cash dividend last year; an oversubscription of Trans-Texas' first public stock offering; a 30-percent traffic gain in 1964 by West Coast; and in-flight movies on Alaska Airlines.

Perhaps next year Congress might consider an ALTA appreciation luncheon. These carriers are making the public investment in short-haul transport look awfully good.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, there has been much concern over the activities of the extreme rightist groups, particularly their activities during the past election campaign. One of these groups, the John Birch Society, has engaged in a hate and smear campaign which attacks the very foundations of our social order. Recently, an instance of such a smear was exposed and completely discredited. The Nashville Tennessean on March 2, 1965, published an excellent editorial concerning the Birch Society, the discredited smear, and the fifth amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and I commend the article to the attention of all Senators.

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

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, Mar. 2, 1965]

BIRCH SOCIETY HAS RIGHT TO TAKE FIFTH AMENDMENT

In Nashville 2 weeks ago, Mr. Reed Benson, Washington coordinator for the John Birch Society, listed some of the principle objectives of the society.

High on the list were the aims to "support the local police" and to impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren because, in the society's view, the Supreme Court is destroying "the safeguards of our Constitutional Republic."

At the same time Mr. Benson, son of former Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, welcomed an investigation by the California State Senate of charges that the society is a secret, subversive organization.

"We pleaded for the investigation," said Mr. Benson. "You don't find Birchers taking the fifth amendment."

On the same day that he was in Nashville, the Los Angeles County Grand Jury returned criminal indictments against four men in a case involving a plot by several right-wing groups to wreck the career of Republican Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

During the grand jury's investigation, members of the John Birch Society took the fifth amendment to keep from telling anything that might incriminate them about one of the most vicious attempts at character assassination in the Nation's political history.

The attacks on Senator KUCHEL were based on an affidavit by a former Los Angeles city policeman that he helped arrest Mr. KUCHEL and another man on a morals charge in 1950. The affidavit also said the case had never come to trial.

The Los Angeles County district attorney said that Senator KUCHEL was not one of the men involved in the 1950 arrest and that the allegations in the affidavit were "false, reckless, malicious, and vicious."

The John Birch Society and other right-wing groups have been out to get rid of Senator KUCHEL because he refused to support Mr. GEORGE MURPHY for U.S. Senator last fall unless the candidate repudiated the backing of the society. The Birchers took the fifth amendment when questioned about distribution of the affidavit through the society's bookstores.

Among those indicted were the former policeman and a police sergeant with long service on the Los Angeles force. The sergeant resigned from the force after refusing to testify before the grand jury.

If this is the kind of support the John Birch Society is going to provide for local police departments, the support will be costly in the loss of prestige and public confidence in the integrity of law enforcement officers.

The John Birch Society claims to be a patriotic anti-Communist organization. When the society's members hide behind the fifth amendment—which they have the right to do—to thwart a grand jury investigation, the organization should not claim that the constitutional guarantees it invokes are being destroyed.

JAMES CASH PENNEY—A MICROCOSM OF AMERICAN INITIATIVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, few American businessmen better exemplify the limitless potential that is inherent in our competitive system of private enterprise than the man who opened a small dry goods store in Kemmerer, Wyo., just 2 years after the turn of the century and who today is the driving force behind the multibillion-dollar chainstore empire which bears the name "J. C. Penney Co."

The meteoric career of the Wyoming dry goods dealer is the subject of a news item in the February 15 Cheyenne, Wyo., State Tribune which I ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks, for I think a tribute to my valued friend, J. C. Penney, is most timely in the context of society's changing attitude toward private enterprise and individual incentive.

James Cash Penney is indeed an extraordinary man. He is an author, humanitarian, and one of the great entrepreneurs of our century. Born on a marginal farm in what was then the Missouri frontier, James Cash Penney has achieved a success so fantastic as to make him a legend in his own time.

In 1902, at the age of 26 and with a history of fending for himself since the age of 8, J. C. Penney opened his first "Golden Rule" store. It is particularly gratifying to me, Mr. President, that this remarkable man should have chosen the Equality State as the launching site for his endeavor. Mr. Penney selected the mining community of Kemmerer, Wyo., as the location for his first venture into the merchandising of dry goods. Today, the J. C. Penney name appears on some 1,700 stores in 48 of our 50 States.

In the 64 years that have elapsed since he opened the doors of his little store in Kemmerer, Mr. Penney has managed to parlay his initial investment of $500 into a massive store complex with gross sales now exceeding $2 billion annually. Yet, despite this enormous growth, the company continues to bear the stamp of its energetic founder who declared at the outset of his career:

> We push all the time. Rust never gathers on a sword that is in use. We are after more business. We are making prices that will get it.

Volume buying, mass merchandising, and aggressive sales policies have combined to bring success to James Cash Penney and the corporation which bears his name. A faith in the future of our capitalistic free enterprise system, and an unceasing desire to improve service and facilities, are indications of an even more expansive future.

Mr. President, the merchant prince from Kemmerer is the holder of a myriad of honors and accolades, including honorary doctoral degrees from my beloved University of Wyoming and no fewer than 14 other universities. The accolades, honors, and successes of Jim Penney serve as graphic proof of the

potential inherent in an economic system which awards creativity and summons self-reliance. Mr. Penney's career was launched in an era in which it was fashionable to rely on one's God-given talents and to work at the business of making a living without reliance upon a public handout or Government incentives.

J. C. Penney waged his own war on poverty, a war which has benefited the lives of the thousands of associates who have shared in the company's profits and the millions of Americans who have benefited from the concepts of mass merchandising techniques he has helped perfect.

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

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Feb. 15, 1965]

JAMES CASH PENNEY AT 89 TAKES LOOK INTO FUTURE

"We are just beginning to scratch the surface of our growth potential."

That was the observation of 89-year-old James Cash Penney, founder of the world's largest department store chain, as he contemplated the future from his office in the new J. C. Penney Building in New York City.

"There is no limit to what the Penney Co. can do," he said, "and this new building and its ultra-modern merchandising facilities will make possible even higher standards of service to the country."

While he is a director, Penney no longer is active in management of the company. He said, "It is my most compelling interest in my life, aside from my family." He is in his 45th-floor office from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. every working day he is in New York.

Looking through his office window at the panorama of Manhattan, he reflected on the past, emphasized the necessity for hard work and spoke optimistically of the future.

"When I opened my first small drygoods store in Kemmerer, Wyo., in 1902, in a space only double the size of this office, I never dreamed that one day we would have our headquarters in a 45-story building in New York.

"At one time I thought we might have 25 stores. Then later I thought that 50 stores would be all we would be able to handle. Now there are nearly 1,700 Penney stores in 48 States, and we are completing the best year in our history, with total sales exceeding $2 billion."

Surrounded by awards he has received in a long and distinguished career in retailing, Mr. Penney stressed that "I am not living in the past." The tradition that in 1902—of "always first quality" merchandise at the lowest possible price—is a vital force with the company today as it was then.

"I have no intention of retiring," he said. "Doctors tell me I'm good for 100 years. When I get up in the morning, it's not just another day to me. I always think in terms of new opportunities and hope to be equal to whatever comes up."

The man from Kemmerer has come a long way.

OUR SOCIETY AND THE HONOR CODE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, a distinguished attorney from Rawlins, Wyo., Mr. Harold M. Johnson, has called to my attention an article from the February 14 Denver, Colo., Post. The article by Dr. Paul H. A. Noren, pastor of Augustana Lutheran Church of Denver, is an excellent treatise on a subject driven home with painful force by the recent scandals at the Air Force Academy. Dr. Noren writes eloquently and forcefully of cheating, and he asks the timely question: "Do we place such emphasis upon success that we imply that it must be won at any cost?"

I request, Mr. President, that the full text of the article by Dr. Noren be printed in the RECORD.

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

OUR SOCIETY AND THE HONOR CODE

(By Paul H. A. Noren, D.D., pastor, Augustana Lutheran Church, Denver)

These thoughts are not meant to be a broadside against the Air Force Academy or its administration. Rather, they are the expression of some basic problems that seem to be endemic in our society. This article seeks to be the distillation of many questions which have been asked by many people in recent days in the scandal of a stolen key, the sale of examination papers, the cheating, the breach of an honor code which states, "We will not lie, steal or cheat, nor tolerate among us anyone who does."

Some among us seek to escape the full implication of the scandal by diversionary thinking which questions the ethical implications of the code itself. The point is that wrong is involved whether such a code exists or not. This is the concern of the thoughtful who wonder where we are headed.

The matter came to our attention dramatically because the Air Force Academy happened to be involved. The institution and its personnel have such an image of excellence that our national honor seems to be tarnished more than if the incident had taken place at Podunk Tech. Further, the issue assumes a larger meaning because these are young men who are being trained for positions of strategic leadership in the Nation.

We lose the point, however, if we fasten all of our attention on one institution where such flagrant evidence of cheating has been turned up. Evidence in a survey of nearly 100 colleges points the finger at almost half the students who by their own admission were involved in cheating.

Some of the questions that force themselves upon us are these: "Is cheating on the increase?" "Has society placed impossible demands upon our youth?" "Do we place such emphasis upon success that we imply that it must be won at any cost?" "Has a permissive psychology (indulged in by adults) become the pattern for youthful behavior?"

The oldest sin in the world is the short-cut. The first honor code may have been involved in the word of God to Adam when He said, "You may freely eat of every tree of the garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day you eat of it you shall die." The restraints were no different in Adam's case than for any of the cadets. Each was given a free will. Each might determine whether he chose to live within this area of honor or not.

Now when the serpent entered into the garden, he asked Eve the question, "Did God say, 'You shall not eat of any tree of the garden?'" And when the woman gave a straight answer, the serpent's rejoinder was, "You will not die. For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil."

Adam and Eve had been promised God-likeness. The Creator would teach His children, and in daily fellowship with Him they should learn to think His thoughts after Him. And now, the serpent offers a short-cut to knowledge, "you will be like God, knowing."

If banishment seems too costly a penalty for guilty Air Academy cadets, we cannot forget the Genesis account, "therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden."

Pressures of all kinds impinge upon our youth, perhaps even in a larger measure upon Air Academy cadets with the fusion of public as well as parental gaze upon them. There is a danger in a status institution such as this to have the desire for success outrun moral balance The fact remains, however, that the honor code was a condition of entrance at the Academy. It wasn't foisted upon the cadets after they had entered.

One can understand the anguish of the parent who cried: "For 19 years you try to bring up a boy to help others and not to be a bearer of tales, and it just doesn't work out." The concept of the Good Samaritan is part and parcel of our moral heritage, just as the informer, the "squealer," is abhorrent to us. Recall, if you will, the loathing reserved for prisoners of war who informed on their fellow Americans.

Yet, there is a clear-cut difference. In the present instance the code requires that dishonesty not be tolerated. With this there can be no compromise.

Rather than pointing a finger at these young men (which well could be a scapegoat gesture), we might do better to look within. The timbers of our civilization are weakening before the dry rot of sin—adult sin, not just the foibles of youth. When Governor Love's Committee on Respect for the Law interviewed a group of high school youths, they complained that their parents were "too busy," "too lenient," "too preoccupied to give guidance at home."

What may we expect of our young when their parents boast of "getting by" with income tax evasions; when a father stations his child in the back seat of an automobile with field glasses to keep watch for the possible approach of a patrol car as the vehicle races over highways at speeds in excess of 90 miles an hour?

May it not well be that we have done an excellent job of divorcing our children, not only from a good parental example, but also from a sense of the reality of God. Being spiritual orphans in an awesomely competitive universe, they have lost any sense of "belonging." The Dutch theologian Albert van den Heuvel, who heads the World Council of Churches' Youth Department, says that secularization is "the process of ever-growing independence from any transcendent control."

In its December 25, 1964, edition, Time magazine states, "In a sense, God—the personal, omnicompetent deity of Christendom—has been dying for centuries. His lordship over the world has been threatened by every scientist who discovered a new natural law of organic growth, by every invention of man that safeguarded him against 'an act of God' disaster, by every new medicine that tamed a disease and solved another mystery of life, But it is the 20th century, the age of technological miracle, that has seen the triumph of the enlightenment and the apparent banishment of God from the universe—even, thanks to Freud, from the human soul."

So, we have come so far as to outlive the necessity of God, and with Him, the moral code. Still, those sticky old Ten Commandments pop up to prick the conscience and to unsettle our equanimity. I remember the quatrain that runs:

"You, too, may call old notions, fudge
And bend your conscience to the dealing.
The Ten Commandments will not budge
And stealing will continue stealing."

And cheating, cheating.

One of the suggestions being made is that we do away with silly old standards. We do have such difficulty accommodating

them to the tentative nature of life today. Honor codes are a thing of the past, if you want to listen not just to locker room conversations but polite dinner talk as well.

Look magazine is an article entitled "Morality USA" (Sept. 14, 1963) closed an otherwise informative piece with the following conclusion: "We are groping, painfully and often blindly, for new standards that will enable us to live morally and decently. The experts feel strongly that we cannot turn back to earlier, more rigid behavior patterns. Almost all the thoughtful, worried people I talked with believe that, unlike people in so many past ages, we have achieved some freedom of choice. We have choices to make about power, money, sex, prejudice and our role in the world. We must find a new moral code that will fit the needs of the society we live in."

Just like that. If the code is too tough for a soft generation, adopt a new and easier one.

What's become of the brave generation, the toughminded, the disciplined who brought America to its pinnacle of excellence? If we continue to love softness, to indulge our ease, to settle for answers that take no struggle of mind and soul, we may as well reconcile ourselves to the sound of the death rattle of our civilization.

One other option remains to us. We may call forth the hero in our soul to stay this moral debacle.

THE FREEDOM ACADEMY GAP

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in speaking on the Freedom Academy bill, 2 weeks ago, I emphasized on pages 4164–4165 of the RECORD, the need for greater sophistication among our own Government people who face Communist nonmilitary aggression in the field. These are the persons upon whom our defense is structured.

Then, last week, I discussed, on pages 4882–4884 of the RECORD, the need that this country provide training for foreign nationals who want to preserve their own national sovereignty against nonmilitary aggression by Communist or other expansive totalitarian powers. A whole new discipline of subversive techniques by the Communists is utilized, particularly against newly independent countries; and formal educational institutions to disseminate to potential practitioners knowledge and familiarity about this discipline are now operating in several Communist countries, training people from nearly every country of the world in the techniques of subversion.

The United States does very little to confront this challenge. Foreign nationals, upon whom rests the obligation to maintain their own national independence from Communist expansionism, have no place to go to acquire knowledge about nonmilitary, subversive techniques to help them know how best to resist this most effective method of aggression.

Today, I shall speak briefly about a third major feature of the proposed Freedom Academy. This is the training of nongovernment persons, persons from the private sector, who could constitute a very potent force in defense against nonmilitary aggression.

Sponsors of the Freedom Academy bill consider the non-Government sector of our heterogeneous democratic society a potentially valuable asset in contesting the Communist antagonist who must by definition be restricted to such homogeneity in emotional and intellectual resources as to constitute his potentially fatal weakness.

The Senators sponsoring this bill reflect this breadth of American diversity which should be our great national strength. Senators CASE, DODD, DOUGLAS, FONG, HICKENLOOPER, LAUSCHE, MILLER, PROUTY, PROXMIRE, SCOTT, SMATHERS, and MURPHY, besides myself, represent all facets of political attitude in this Nation, ranging from conservative to liberal, which are within the main current of American political thought. In supporting this bill, we express our common view that this strength of American heterogeneity is not adequately utilized in order to protect our national interests abroad.

From section 2(a)(8)(IV) of the Freedom Academy bill, I read:

> The private sector must understand how it can participate in the global struggle in a sustained and systematic manner. There exists in the private sector a huge reservoir of talent, ingenuity, and strength which can be developed and brought to bear in helping to solve many of our global problems. We have hardly begun to explore the range of possibilities.

The bill makes broad provision for better utilizing this talent.

A remarkable article in a recent issue of Orbis, the world-affairs journal published by the University of Pennsylvania, now adds greater substance to our proposal. The article is authored by Alexander T. Jordan, an authority on political communication and psychological warfare, who also is a commentator for Radio Free Europe. He entitled the article "Political Communication: The Third Dimension of Strategy." It appears in the fall, 1964, edition.

The article concerns the science of political communication, a science in which our country has fallen critically behind; we hardly even recognize its existence. Powers antagonistic to our national interests are far more knowledgeable than we. According to George Gallup:

> Russia is a good generation ahead of us in her understanding of propaganda and in her skill in using it.

Another recognized authority, Murray Dyer, observes:

> In Russian hands the psychological instrument has been used with consummate skill and no little success. It seems to be generally admitted that in our own hands both the skill and the success have been more limited.

But the purpose of Mr. Jordan's essay is not simply to criticize United States efforts in psychological warfare. Rather, he plumbs the "one major aspect of the psychological arm of strategy, namely, long-range ideological conversion."

This concerns us. We are obviously under attack throughout the world. The expansionism of Communist China is particularly aggressive, and the Chinese Communists utilize these techniques:

> Yet little is done to forge new weapons and develop new techniques which will give us a chance to win the psychological war. * * *. The various classifications of political communication differ among themselves at least as much as the Strategic Air Command differs from the Coast Guard. Each requires a different approach, different techniques, and different organizational structures. There is a tendency to overlook this fact and to demand simply more propaganda, without specifying the type required.
>
> U.S. shortcomings lie particularly in the area of long-range ideological change.

I interject that a great part of the Freedom Academy effort would be expended in research directed exactly here—at understanding international and intercultural political communication. The first of the principal functions assigned to the Freedom Commission by this bill is:

> 1. To conduct research designed to improve the methods and means by which the United States seeks its national objectives in the nonmilitary part of the global struggle. This should include improvement of the present methods and means and exploration of the full range of additional methods and means that may be available to us in both the Government and private sectors.

Mr. Jordan identifies what he considers our outstanding need:

> What is needed is an organic system of political communication. * * * By organic, as opposed to inert, we mean a system in which the operating methods and even the organizational structure are determined by the ideas to be propagated.
>
> The organic approach would begin with the selection of ideas. The next step would be to find people who believe these ideas firmly enough to impart their conviction to others.

People who believe in the values we try to propagate. Are there people who really believe in American values?—

> Some object that "convinced political communicators" will be hard to find; if that is true, then it would seem that American ideas are hardly worth propagating abroad and we face eventual defeat on the ideological level.

There are many such people among us; but Government officials do not make good communicators of this kind. The reasons are obvious. Because of their very association with Government, officials cannot effectively propagate a political philosophy among a people alien to it:

> The model for successful political communication is to be found * * * in the patient labors and intense convictions of missionaries of religious and political faiths—from St. Paul to Lenin. An organization dedicated to spreading its ideas among others should start with a group of passionate believers.

Mr. Jordan emphasizes:

> The most urgent need * * * is to utilize the spiritual energy of such people, while guiding and assisting them in accordance with national policy.

A basic principle, which he identifies, in such an organic communications system is this:

> The communicator's intensity of conviction is the critical factor in his effectiveness (persuasiveness).

Mr. Jordan continues:

> Effective political action, especially in the long-range strategic sphere, must take the form of advocacy. Mere distribution of information * * * is not enough.

Senators know this. It is clearly true. Successful practitioners of domestic poli-

tics advocate something; they seek to persuade.

Mr. President, the Freedom Academy, or an institution like it, would stand in perfect accord with this understanding.

Here is precisely the reason why the sponsors of the bill want suitable training for private individuals. The United States sends hundreds of thousands of its private citizens to reside abroad. A great many believe fervently in our institutions. All that is needed to make of them a very effective force for propagation of our beliefs is to let them know how and where they can be politically influential.

Mr. Jordan offers examples of the potential impact of such individuals acting independently of the Government.

> A typical example * * * is the Center for Christian Democratic Action in New York, which endeavors to promote Christian democracy in Latin America. It is a private body * * * but it has behind it the authority of strong parties in Western Europe. It also has the support of important sections of public opinion in Latin America.

A Christian Democratic Party, incidentally, has just won control of a Latin American government, through a popular election.

Other groups? The AFL–CIO is already in the field. People in their program support the Freedom Academy bill. The National Association of Manufacturers certainly is interested in promoting free enterprise. The American Bar Association promotes the rule of law. Veterans organizations have common interests internationally.

Supporters of the Freedom Academy concept propose to utilize such a potential as this. There are hundreds of only slightly effective groups. This diversity in democratic life is our real strength, but it is one which we refuse to utilize in present-day foreign relations. According to Mr. Jordan:

> We would commit a major error if we tried to use Communist methods in reverse, merely substituting white for black and vice versa. The use of entirely original methods, reflecting the character and way of life of the United States, would place the Communists on the defensive.

It is now time for us to bring our real strength up to the firing line in this new day of determined and deliberate nonmilitary warfare. It is time to call up strong reserves. We should no longer rely on skeleton forces delegated to perform a job which requires our best effort if we are going to win.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Political Communication: The Third Dimension of Strategy," written by Alexander T. Jordan, and published in the fall, 1964, issue of the University of Pennsylvania's journal of foreign affairs, Orbis, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

POLITICAL COMMUNICATION: THE THIRD DIMENSION OF STRATEGY

(By Alexander Jordan)

Military power and diplomacy comprise the two conventional dimensions of strategy, and economic action is sometimes called the "third arm of statecraft."[1] By the third dimension in this article, however, we mean all efforts, not confined to dealings between governments, to influence foreign audiences—whether we call it propaganda, political communication or psychological warfare. While less easily defined than the other two, this third sphere of strategy is recognized by political scientists—though not always by politicians—as equal to them in importance.

American weakness in this third dimension is deplored by writers on the subject. "It is my personal belief that Russia is a good generation ahead of us in her understanding of propaganda and in her skill in using it," wrote George Gallup.[2] Murray Dyer has commented: "In Russian hands the psychological instrument has been used with consummate skill and no little success. It seems to be generally admitted that in our own hands both the skill and the success have been more limited."[3] Another writer noted: "The psychological warfare of the West is waged almost exclusively by America, or at least with American money; however, it is unsuccessful."[4] Arthur Krock, New York Times columnist, entitled one of his articles on this subject "Why We Are Losing the Psychological War."[5] Books such as "The Propaganda Gap," "The Weapon on the Wall" and "The Idea Invaders" contain critiques of the U.S. psychological warfare effort by Americans dismayed to see their country second best in a field which they regard as vital.[6]

The purpose of this article is not to criticize the current U.S. program in psychological warfare, although some reference will be made to its shortcomings. Rather, we will examine at some length one major aspect of the psychological arm of strategy, namely, long-range ideological conversion, and recommend introducing into the overall U.S. effort an "organic system of political communication" which places more emphasis on the role of private, i.e., nongovernmental, institutions.

THE NEED TO FOCUS ATTENTION ON TECHNIQUES

In the many studies devoted to the subject of psychological warfare, major attention has generally been focused on broad lines of policy and on the status of pertinent Government agencies. Little attention has been given to the actual operating procedures and techniques. "The history of this instrument, roughly for the past 25 years, shows very clearly that a great deal of effort has been expended on who should control it, i.e., Department of Defense or State. By comparison relatively little effort has been spent on what the instrument ought to be doing and what its main job was."[7] In other words, there has been much concern with what should be said and who is to be in charge of saying it, but little thought as to the technique of conveying the message to its target.

This omission would seem to imply that the critics consider the current techniques satisfactory. If that were indeed the case, victory in the battle for the minds of men could be achieved by finding the right message and then leaving its transmission to an agency with an adequate budget and a proper status within the structure of government.[8] This is, of course, a dangerous oversimplification. For while it is obvious that the scale of operations of the third arm of strategy must be substantially increased before a proper balance among the three instruments can be attained, there is an even greater need for a major revision of thinking on the subject.

Nothing less than a systemic revolution in the field of Western political communication can turn the tide of battle in the war for the minds of men. The assertion that the outcome of that war, rather than the outcome of one fought with nuclear weapons, will determine the fate of the United States and of Western civilization is almost a cliché of political writing and speechmaking. Yet little is done to forge new weapons and develop new techniques which will give us a chance to win the psychological war.

Even some of the most vehement advocates of a "psychological offensive" seem to think that the only weaknesses of present USIA (U.S. Information Agency) activities lie in their limited scope and insufficient coordination with the other branches of government. Hence they conclude that an increased budget and a direct line to the White House would solve the problem. Such an oversimplified view suggests a failure to differentiate properly between various types of political communication. Military power—the first instrument of strategy—includes air, naval and land forces, which are not identical either in their character, deployment or operations. The various classifications of political communication differ among themselves at least as much as the Strategic Air Command differs from the Coast Guard. Each requires a different approach, different techniques and different organizational structures. There is a tendency to overlook this fact and to demand simply more propaganda, without specifying the type required.

The customary subdivision of political communication into strategic and tactical categories is not an adequate guide for fashioning instruments of psychological warfare. There is also an important dividing line between ideological conversion and all activity—both strategic and tactical—aimed at securing "relevant political action." The two fields inevitably overlap, but U.S. shortcomings lie particularly in the area of long-range ideological change. While less immediate in its effects, ideological conversion provides the indispensable infrastructure for strategic and tactical action toward specific objectives. The strength of Soviet political communication is precisely in this sphere, while in the medium-range and tactical fields the disparity between East and West is not as striking.

In advocating an enlarged U.S. effort, most writers fail to distinguish between these different types of endeavor and simply recommend increasing the budget of the USIA and enlisting advertising talents in the campaign

---

[1] Murray Dyer, "The Potentialities of American Psychological Statecraft," in "Propaganda and the Cold War," a Princeton University symposium edited by John Boardman Whitton (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1963).

[2] Ibid., "The Challenge of Ideological Warfare."

[3] Dyer, op. cit.

[4] Bela Szunyogh, "Psychological Warfare: An Introduction to Ideological Propaganda and the Techniques of Psychological Warfare" (New York: The William-Frederick Press, 1955).

[5] New York Times Magazine, Dec. 8, 1957.

[6] Walter Joyce, "The Propaganda Gap" (New York: Harper & Row, 1963); Murray Dyer, "Weapon on the Wall" (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959); George N. Gordon, Irving Falk, and William Hodapp, "The Idea Invaders" (New York: Communications Arts Books, Hastings House, 1963).

[7] Dyer, "The Potentialities of American Psychological Statecraft," op. cit.

[8] The idea that world opinion can be won over merely by spending more money and appointing a new Cabinet officer is similar to the suggestion that the problem of cancer could be solved in a few years by a crash program with a multi-billion-dollar budget. Scientists point out, however, that the solution to the cancer problem is a matter of brains rather than funds, that all the qualified researchers are already at work, and that their number could not be rapidly increased at any cost. In both these suggestions we are faced with a mechanistic outlook, inclined to substitute money for creative insights.

of "selling America to the world." This might be a valid approach in dealing with political communication at the level of "relevant political action," but it falls far short of what is needed to bolster U.S. efforts at long-range strategic conversion. Much more basic changes are necessary in methods of action, organizational structure and operating procedures if we are to reverse the trend and strengthen the third instrument of foreign policy.

AN ORGANIC SYSTEM OF COMMUNICATION

Nature of an organic system: What is needed is an organic system of political communication serving as a means of long-range conversion and cooperating with existing strategic and tactical psychological operations. By organic, as opposed to inert, we mean a system in which the operating methods and even the organizational structure are determined by the ideas to be propagated.

Organic communication systems are as old as the great religious faiths which, in their earlier stages at least, were seldom propagated by inert, bureaucratic methods. The innovation suggested here consists in consciously promoting the organic features of a communication system at the expense of the inert ones. That has certainly not been done by any Western government.[9]

An organic communication system would differ basically from a conventional one in the sequence of its operations. The conventional approach starts with the appointment of an administrative staff, which then hires professional communicators and seeks ideas to propagate. The organic approach would begin with the selection of ideas. The next step would be to find people who believe these ideas firmly enough to impart their conviction to others. Some may be trained communicators and others not, but it is easier to impart communications skills than intensity of belief—especially since professional communicators, by the nature of their calling, often tend to develop an attitude of doubt or even cynicism. Once assembled, a team of dedicated persons should be given a fairly free hand in propagating its idea, and should be given such technical assistance as it may require. Far more mental energy would be released by such a method than could ever be delivered by a conventional organization working for the same objectives.

The importance of conviction: The model for successful political communication is to be found not in the dull bulletins of governments, nor in the flamboyant prose of copywriters, but in the patient labors and intense convictions of missionaries of religious and political faiths—from Saint Paul to Lenin. An organization dedicated to spreading its ideas among others should start with a group of passionate believers.[10] There are thousands of people in the United States who believe fervently in ideas which, if adopted in other countries, could serve the long-range interests of national policy. These individuals would not make good diplomats or information officers, but they could make excellent propagandists. The most urgent need of the third arm of strategy is to utilize the spiritual energy of such people, while guiding and assisting them in accordance with national policy. No attempt should be made, however, to try to make their activity merely a carbon copy of current tactical and medium-range policies.

The importance of what might be called the conviction coefficient has been demonstrated by many propaganda campaigns of the past. In the period between the two World Wars several Central European nations engaged in strenuous political communication efforts, directed largely against one another. Although their objectives are now irrelevant, these efforts merit our attention because of their success in proportion to the means used. The budgets and the numbers of personnel employed were but a minute fraction of those now at the disposal of the USIA; yet the worldwide effectiveness of their persuasive efforts was impressive. This is attributable not to the Central Europeans' superior knowledge of communication techniques, but rather to their firm conviction of the righteousness of their respective causes. Armed with such conviction, a single agent working from his apartment in a foreign city may sometimes achieve a greater impact on the public opinion of the country than can a large government information office. Even tiny Lithuania managed to make the West aware of her claims to Vilno, while the Ukrainians—though without a state of their own—conducted active propaganda campaigns in Western Europe and in the United States. The results of these endeavors, while perhaps not significant in terms of "relevant political action," were quite impressive in relation to the puny resources committed.

These cases illustrate one of the basic principles of an organic communication system: the communicator's intensity of conviction is the critical factor in his effectiveness (persuasiveness). The objective value of the propositions advocated is comparatively irrelevant, particularly as it is not susceptible to any scientific measurement.

Government agencies and the organic system: There is another important reason for recommending an organic communication system—not as a substitute for the existing one, but as a coequal auxiliary. If political communication activities are to be expanded in volume—as they must be if we are to achieve substantial results—that expansion should not simply take the form of a bigger and better Government agency. A huge ministry of propaganda would be both inadequate and undesirable. Such a centralized agency might be a suitable instrument for spreading a dogmatic and codified doctrine. In this sense Dr. Goebbels' Propagandaministerium was an organic body, since its structure and discipline reflected the character of the Nazi movement. But when the subject of communication is to be a vast body of thought which might be described, for want of a better term, as "the philosophy of Western civilization," the use of a huge centralized bureaucracy for its propagation would constitute a basic contradiction. Any attempt to spread an essentially pluralistic culture though a single agency of one government would be a denial of the very philosophy we are advocating, as well as a psychological blunder. It would be a violation of the principles of organic communication.

Vast expansion of the USIA to handle these new activities would place an undesirable official stamp on them. Moreover, political action in the field requires personal initiative and a readiness for risk taking which are not characteristics commonly associated with bureaucracies. That is why increasing the budget of the USIA many times over and giving its Director equal status with the Secretary of State would not solve the real problem of bringing the third arm of strategy up to full strength.

Effective political action, especially in the long-range strategic sphere, must take the form of advocacy. Mere distribution of information, even selected and slanted, is not enough. "From this view of the nature of foreign policy, and of the psychological instrument of statecraft," one commentator has noted, "it follows that the 'information' approach to psychological operations is woefully insufficient." [11] The tactical and medium-range activities of the USIA should be continued and even expanded, but they can never substitute for true political action of a more basic nature. In any case, no Government agency can openly engage in political action abroad; international law is explicit in prohibiting such activity by governments.[12]

The inappropriateness of advertising techniques: The other standard suggestion for strengthening U.S. psychological operations, that we use advertising techniques in selling our political philosophy to other nations, is potentially even more harmful and reflects a profound misunderstanding of the whole issue. Because commercial advertising bears some superficial resemblance to political communication, its practitioners conclude that the two are interchangeable. The differences between them, however, are more significant than their similarities. Furthermore, the cost of using advertising techniques on a world scale would be prohibitive, and high-pressure campaigns might well evoke adverse reactions. This approach would be the least organic of all. "Advertising men have their function—on the American scene and inside the American economy. But the world situation calls for a totally different type of professionals. Political propaganda, a task of extraordinary complexity, requires intellectuals, scholars, specialists, and—in the final analysis—political philosophers." [13]

SOME ADVANTAGES OF THE ORGANIC SYSTEM

In summing up the shortcomings of the U.S. effort in the field of political communication, John B. Whitton points to: (1) The lack of clear objectives; (2) the lack of confidence in our efforts; and (3) the purely defensive character of our efforts.[14] Although Whitton was referring to the entire communication effort, his observations are particularly applicable to long-range ideological conversion. All three areas of weakness could be bolstered by a program of organic communication, based on the better utilization of existing intellectual and spiritual resources.

The causes for these major areas of weakness are not difficult to find. The first is related to the commonly heard argument that we have no single great idea to sell, hence our efforts tend to be reactive and defensive. "Our policy has been too negative, its programs and slogans almost always a mere response, or reaction, to the more imaginative initiatives of the Soviets. Hence, it is claimed, we have been unable to provide for the West the inspiration and leadership the situation demands and our great strength warrants." [15] Furthermore, in a democracy, a governmental propaganda strategy is unlikely to have clear objectives for

---

[9] The possibility of creating an organic system of communication has been glimpsed, but sufficient attention has never been given to it. Senator KARL E. MUNDT, in a briefing paper presented to the White House in 1962, noted that: "The private sector must know how it can participate in the global struggle in a sustained and systematic manner. There exists in the private sector a huge reservoir of talent, ingenuity, and strength which can be developed and brought to bear in helping solve our cold war problems." "Propaganda and the Cold War, op. cit., p. 75.

[10] This is one of the reason why civil servants are generally inappropriate for this purpose: they may be passionate believers, but their first allegiance is to official policies; they are not free to act in accordance with the intensity of their convictions.

[11] Robert T. Holt, "A New Approach to Political Communication," in "Propaganda and the Cold War," op. cit.

[12] L. John Martin, "International Propaganda, Its Legal and Diplomatic Control" (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958), pp. 62–108.

[13] Saul K. Padover in the American Scholar, April 1951.

[14] John B. Whitton, "The American Effort Challenged," in "Propaganda and the Cold War," op. cit.

[15] Whitton, op. cit.

these might offend certain sections of domestic political opinion. Official objectives must be phrased in a manner acceptable to all domestic political factions, and as a result they often become so watered down that they lose their attraction for the peoples of other cultures.

These are all very real obstacles. While one may argue that freedom and democracy are ideas or ideologies that can be articulated and packaged for distribution abroad, these concepts often appear vague and irrelevant to the target audience. One solution is to give these ideas more concrete form through person-to-person contact: this becomes the task of the private political communicator. While he must serve the interests of national policy formulated by the President, the political communicator must also have the freedom to interpret broad national policies and goals, and to go far beyond official statements in explaining the "American way of life." Private organizations devoted to political communication can set themselves clear objectives and, unhampered by official connection with the Government, they can afford to be more candid in pursuing these objectives than can our public servants.

The lack of confidence in our efforts, which Whitton lists as the second failing, is due largely to the absence of clear objectives and the limited achievements to date of the American propaganda effort. If a private political communication organization were permitted to establish its own objectives, select its own method of operation and subdivide the overall task into a number of separate endeavors, this obstacle might not seem so formidable. A private association, selecting a limited number of targets in a specific territory, would be more likely to give its members a tangible sense of accomplishment than a Government agency which endeavors to do everything everywhere and thereby dilutes its efforts to the point where they become largely ineffective. Unlike civil servants inhibited by their official responsibility, private communicators would not confine themselves to purely defensive tactics. The morale of troops in the field is always at its highest in offensive action, at their lowest in holding operations. The private organization would be composed of individuals selected to propagate abroad a coherent set of ideas which they hold very strongly. Some object that convinced political communicators will be hard to find; if that is true, then it would seem that American ideas are hardly worth propagating abroad and we face eventual defeat on the ideological level. But the assumption here is that many Americans do feel strongly enough about their political heritage to serve as propagandists.

The defensive character of the American communication effort—the third weakness—is largely due to the restraints of governmental action. A separation between long-range ideological conversion and current U.S. foreign policy would remove this handicap. The ban on political initiative, implicit in diplomacy, tends to discourage some of our ablest civil servants and contributes to the second failing—lack of confidence in our effort. The situation bears an analogy to the loss of morale in the U.S. Air Force resulting from the ban on crossing the Yalu River during the Korean war. The Government is, of course, justified in forbidding its civil servants to adopt an offensive political posture. Since they are representatives of the U.S. Government, their statements are subject to close scrutiny abroad and serious complications could follow any indiscretion. The problem, then, is not one of changing the operating rules of the existing agency, but of transferring those aspects of political communication in which it cannot engage to an instrument capable of doing so.

The organizational form for such a political communication instrument should be kept as flexible as possible. Various groups may be formed for the purpose of spreading particular aspects of American political thought or culture, or for working in specific countries and among different types of persons. As purely private organizations, without official status, they would be able to integrate closely with local communities. They should not isolate themselves in the international compounds of capital cities. They would have to be accepted by the local populace or quit. The members might not necessarily be American citizens, and they would not have to be screened as closely as Government employees. This would involve no risk, since the security problems that exist in tactical and medium-range strategic psychological operations are not present in long-range ideological communication. Communicators need not have access to any classified information, nor would they require any knowledge of overall plans. Their activity would be wholly overt and involve no secrecy. There should be no connection between persuaders and intelligence collectors, for their tasks are clearly incompatible. It is always possible that in some countries propagandists may be suspected of espionage. To avoid such charges, they should be kept completely clear of any compromising contacts.

Under such a loosely organized system some errors might occur occasionally, through incompetence or excess of zeal. However, their importance should not be overrated in weighing the immense advantages of an organic communication system. Since the members of private organizations working in the field would have no official status, any faux pas they might commit would be no more compromising than those of an ordinary tourist. Civil servants, including the personnel of information services, may be guilty of few flagrant faults, but their official capacity permits of even fewer conspicuous achievements. The Soviet Government dissociates itself from Communist propaganda activities abroad very simply, by subordinating the Agitprop to the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, rather than to the Government of the U.S.S.R.[16] The distinction appears purely academic, but in practice it provides an effective shield.

An organic system of communication would also avoid the tendency of all bureaucracies to spend as much time and energy in reporting to headquarters as in performing their primary functions. In a flexible organization, run on the lines of a fraternal association rather than on those of a Government bureau, there would be little need for voluminous reports and ratings, and persons evaluating the performance of others will have worked in the field themselves. This is an important point, for in the sphere of communication few objective yardsticks of achievement are available.

WHY AN ORGANIC SYSTEM WOULD BE MORE EFFECTIVE

The operation of an organic communication system with specific missions allocated to separate groups might be compared to illuminating a distant target with beams of coherent light emitted by a laser. Each laser beam uses a single wavelength and a single color, permitting far greater concentration of energy and more accurate aiming of the beam than is possible with a beam of ordinary diffused light, comprised of all colors mixed together. Thus a program devoted to a single set of ideas will more readily find its target than an ideologically amorphous campaign aimed at everyone and hitting nobody. When a target is struck simultaneously by many single-color beams of coherent light, the illumination will be better than if it had been lighted from a single source of diffused, so-called white light. Moreover, it will be possible to avoid the transmission losses of diffused light which did not hit the target at all. The overall efficiency between the energy input and the amount of light received at the target will be many times greater when laser beams are used. The same is true in the propagation of thought: the penetration force of well-defined "coherent" concepts is greater than that of nebulous and diffused ones, and the sum of these concepts will convey greater meaning than generalized ideas can. The difference, as in optics, is in employing a method of transmission which avoids excessive losses.

The importance of using a specific approach, clearly defined both as to content and target area, is particularly great when the amount of energy available for input and the choice of objectives are limited. One of the major shortcomings of advertising techniques when applied to political persuasion is the relatively indiscriminate character of their appeal. The number of potential purchasers of soap or cigarettes may almost coincide with the total population, but the number of persons wielding political influence does not. That is why the use of mass appeal in foreign action is doubly misdirected: it seldom affects the majority and is likely to miss the vital minority.

A specialized organization with clearly defined and limited objectives is better equipped to reach its particular target—those persons who are likely to be receptive to the ideas which it propagates. Such an approach may result ultimately in the establishment of close links between groups of people in different countries. Societies for international friendship in general founder in a flood of pious declarations and cliches. Associations for friendship between two nations sometimes do better, though they also tend to specialize in platitudes and lofty speechmaking. But associations devoted to promoting cooperation and friendly relations between two nations in a specific field of thought or action are more likely to achieve tangible results. If they exist in sufficient numbers, such operational and binational organizations can accomplish, cumulatively, far more than worldwide associations dedicated to furthering the brotherhood of man. If a small proportion of the economic aid now given to foreign governments were channeled through such bodies, the political effectiveness of U.S. aid programs would be vastly increased.

An organic communication system would foster the establishment of a greater number of such specific links between well-defined groups in different countries. As in an atomic pile where no chain reaction occurs until the number of neutrons emitted reaches a critical level, so in a target area undergoing psychological penetration the reaction will not become self-sustaining until the paths of the diverse and apparently random messages begin to intersect each other in sufficient numbers. In the absence of mathematical formulas dealing with the prerequisites for a psychopolitical chain reaction, we have to rely on empirical observation and a study of recorded cases. It is clear, however, that by whatever method we might measure it, the political radiation we are now emitting is far from the level necessary for starting a chain reaction.

USE OF EXISTING ORGANIZATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

Organizations carrying out programs compatible with an organic communication system already exist, but the scale of their activities is too limited for an accurate evaluation of results. Furthermore, they now operate on a random, ad hoc basis; within the framework of an organic system they would be given specific missions.

[16] See Evron M. Kirkpatrik, editor, "Target: The World" (New York: Macmillan, 1956).

A typical example of such an organization is the Center for Christian Democratic Action in New York, which endeavors to promote Christian Democracy in Latin America. It is a private body, staffed by Americans, Europeans and Latin Americans, and enjoying some support from American foundations. Christian Democracy has the advantage of being a genuine ideology with a positive content, rather than merely a reaction against communism. It did not originate in the United States, and is therefore free from association with "Yanqui imperialism," but it has behind it the authority of strong parties in Western Europe. It also has the support of important sections of public opinion in Latin America. Support given to Christian Democracy in Latin America may provide a better antidote to communism than some openly pro-American activities. This does not mean, however, that other deserving movements should not also be encouraged. If only one party were supported, it would soon be labeled the "pro-American party," with all the adverse consequences of such a designation. One of the weaknesses of a Government agency is that its rigid policy lines and its official character may make it difficult to back simultaneously several movements competitive with each other. Yet such apparent inconsistency might be the wisest course in some situations.

American labor organizations have already entered the international field, endeavoring to promote their ideology. One could imagine the National Association of Manufacturers doing the same for the philosophy of free enterprise, the American Bar Association for the rule of law, the American Legion for cooperation with veterans, and so on. The fact that the activities of these private bodies might be overlapping and even to some extent contradictory would not detract from their effectiveness. On the contrary, the variety of viewpoints would reflect the pluralistic nature of a free society, while the consensus of all on basic issues would illustrate the possibility of combining free expression with national solidarity. Such an approach, diametrically opposed to the monolithic Communist method, would convey the American message not only through its actual content, but also through the manner of its communication.

The director of an organic communication system would use specific ideological programs, selected for their force of penetration as well as their content, to create a mental picture even as an artist uses pigments to create a painting. Inevitably, such a picture would become meaningful only in the overall perspective. Its pattern would then emerge from the apparently jumbled juxtaposition of colors. Conventional communication, on the other hand, paints a single-color image in which the overall pattern is constantly repeated in miniature.

The presence in a foreign country of a number of American-inspired communication organizations, each handling a separate aspect of political, social, cultural or technical activity, and each pursuing its own aims yet remaining in basic harmony with the others, would be a most convincing scale-model demonstration of the practical working of a free society. This accomplishment could never be duplicated by the Communists, and that would be its most valuable feature.

We would commit a major error if we tried to use Communist methods in reverse, merely substituting white for black and vice versa. The use of entirely original methods, reflecting the character and way of life of the United States, would place the Communists on the defensive.

In military strategy there is often the temptation to build a replica of the type of force with which we are threatened, instead of concentrating on a type of force which the enemy could not easily duplicate or defend against. So in psychological warfare the subconscious desire to match the opposition exactly in methods and tactics is always present. The greatest strength of the United States in opposition to communism lies not—as is sometimes assumed—in its superior material resources, but rather in the ability of its people to work together in harmony in the midst of many differences. A visible demonstration of that capacity for cooperation and for releasing individual energies within a diversified, flexible communication system, working through a variety of channels for a broad common purpose, would be more impressive to foreign observers than mere declarations of principle.

An example of the efficiency of the organic method of communication is provided by the international editions of Reader's Digest, which supply an estimated 30 million readers with material likely to strengthen their loyalty to the West and open their eyes to the deceptions of communism. It is possible that the international editions of the Reader's Digest, which cost the taxpayers nothing, contribute as much to the understanding of the American idea abroad as all the publications of the U.S. Government specifically designed for foreign readers. Precisely because it is not primarily a propaganda medium, the Reader's Digest carries conviction and secures paying readers.

Many other American periodicals could be adapted for foreign readers merely by eliminating subjects of purely domestic interest. They could provide a communication medium far superior to the pamphlets specially produced for that purpose. A system of subsidies permitting leading magazines to put out foreign editions would be less costly than trying to produce special publications. The identity of a well-established American periodical gives it an authority which a propaganda pamphlet does not possess. The Spanish editions of some American magazines prove the feasibility of such operations. One can only wonder why this has not already been done on an adequate scale.

While it would be undesirable to try to imitate Communist methods, any communication effort counteracting the Communist offensive would have to match it in sheer volume of operations.[17] International Communist front groups claim a membership running into hundreds of millions; international broadcasting originating in Communist countries totals 1,672 hours weekly; 29,736,000 copies of books in free world languages were published in the U.S.S.R. in 1954; and Communist Parties in Western Europe alone claim a membership of over 3 million.[18]

CONCLUSIONS

The vast scale and diverse nature of the operations required rules out the single Government agency approach. Experience has demonstrated that Government bureaus become unmanageable beyond a certain size and that further increases in personnel fail to produce a corresponding increase in useful output. If, as has been suggested, the single information agency were to become an appendage of the State Department, confusion would be further compounded.

The Government agency responsible for directing the overall strategy of political communication should be a supervisory, not an operating, body. Its function would be to set targets and offer some degree of guidance, without attempting to perform the actual task in the field. Such an agency, whatever its status within the structure of Government, should have a small staff of senior experts, but no operating branches. It would differ entirely in purpose and character from the USIA as it exists today and it should not be associated with it, either in personnel or in operational patterns.

Recognition of the inherent inability of any governmental body to undertake certain types of political action and transfer of this work to organizations capable of doing so would represent a real turning point in our political communications procedure. The point of contact between such organizations and the Government would be narrow, but vital. There is ample precedent for private bodies receiving Government grants for the performance of specific duties, such as research or education. Once it is recognized that international communication at the long-range ideological level should not be a function only of the Federal Government, suitable ways and means of supporting it will evolve, and the Government will still have a large measure of control over the recipients of such support.

An organic communication system such as the one roughly sketched here is, by its very nature, incompatible with crash programs. It has to be built up gradually, starting in the case of each project with an idea or a definite objective, not with a readymade organization. Since the individual projects, by reason of their specialized nature, cannot be very large, the overall effect can only be attained by multiplying their number.

The effectiveness of such an approach will not become evident until the sum of all the individual endeavors reaches proportions comparable to those of official operations in the same sphere. Although no accurate measurements are possible in this field, it is clear that an organic system would give a higher return on the investment of human and material resources than an inert one. Furthermore, the results of its operation are more permanent and can become self-sustaining. Any communication effort without a built-in capacity for self-propagation is futile. In this respect, the organic system might be compared to cloud-seeding operations which use a few pounds of silver iodide to release thousands of tons of rain, while the conventional method resembles a project which sends up aircraft with tanks full of water to sprinkle the countryside with imitation showers.

[17] One expert, George Gallup, had this to say about the cost of an American psychological warfare program: "Some years ago I had suggested to a senatorial committee that $5 billion spent on today's tanks, guns and battleships will make far less difference in achieving ultimate victory over communism than $5 billion appropriated for ideological warfare." "The Challenge of Ideological Warfare," in "Propaganda and the Cold War," op. cit.

[18] Kirkpatrick, op. cit.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF MOBILE ON BROOKLEY AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last November the people of Mobile, Ala., learned that Brookley Air Force Base was scheduled by the Department of Defense to be phased out and closed by 1969. The announcement that reported the plans to close Brookley Field also reported the Department's intentions to close or partially close 94 other defense installations. The total number of bases around the world that have been or will be affected by similar actions taken since 1961 now stands at 669. Most of them are within the United States.

When completed, these actions to shut down or reduce in size 669 defense installations will result in the elimination of 149,000 job positions and annual budget reductions of over $1 billion.

No one is against the general proposition that Federal defense programs must be kept up to date. On the other hand, when a decision is made to phase out and to close an installation such as Brookley

Air Force Base, which has served our Nation well for so many years, it is the plain duty of those who represent the affected area in Congress to satisfy themselves fully that the Department's judgment was correct. It is also the duty of Senators and Representatives to do everything they can to lessen the economic impact of such a decision, in the event they are unable to persuade the Department of Defense that the decision was not correct.

I am by no means persuaded that the Department of Defense acted wisely and correctly in making its decision to phase out the Mobile Air Materiel Area, and thereafter to close Brookley Air Force Base. I remain hopeful that my efforts to bring about a reversal or partial reversal of the decision may yet succeed. But, in all candor, I must confess that there is as yet no sign that they will. My duty and my course, therefore, are clear: I shall continue the efforts I have been making, with all means at my command, to keep Brookley open; but I shall also, in every way that I can, assist the Mobile Chamber of Commerce and other civic and industrial leaders in the admirable efforts they are making to prepare for the eventuality that Brookley may in fact be closed.

This is a report to the people of Mobile and the employees at Brookley on our activities and progress to date, in both these areas of effort: to keep the field open, and to prepare for the possibility of its closing. I believe that this report will also prove useful to other communities around the country which are in similar situations.

THE EFFORT TO KEEP BROOKLEY FIELD OPEN

Immediately after the November 19, 1964, announcement of the scheduled phaseout of 95 additional defense installations, including Brookley Air Force Base, Senator HILL and I sought an appointment for ourselves and a delegation of Mobile civic leaders with the top officials of the Department of Defense. We met wtih Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance and Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert, and members of their staffs, on December 8.

At this meeting, we presented a paper that had been prepared by H. Austill Pharr and E. Earl Benson, cochairmen of the Special Study Group for Continuation of Brookley Air Force Base, entitled "Six Reasons Why the Phaseout of Brookley Air Force Base and MOAMA Does Not Reduce Costs and Improve Efficiency Without Impairing the National Defense Posture." The headings of the six reasons were:

First. Brookley Air Force Base keeps the F–105 weapon system on its "go" status.

Second. Brookley Air Force Base is the Air Force Logistic Command's most efficient operation.

Third. Brookley Air Force Base's geographic location gives it strategic importance to national defense.

Fourth. Brookley's phaseout cannot be amortized to show appreciable savings to the Government.

Fifth. Brookley is efficient because it is not too big. Adding Brookley's mission to existing air materiel areas makes them less efficient.

Sixth. Brookley plays an important role in the unfolding of the President's Great Society.

It is my understanding that copies of this thoughtful document are available from the Mobile Chamber of Commerce, of which the paper's coauthor, Mr. Benson, is the vigorous and able president.

Unfortunately, the arguments presented were insufficient to bring about a reversal of the Department's decision. A lengthy letter from Deputy Secretary Vance, written to me on December 19, apprised me of that fact.

Subsequently, Senator HILL, Representative RIVERS, and I met with President Johnson for still further discussion of this matter. The President gave us a very attentive hearing. As a matter of fact, we were with him for 1½ hours. At the conclusion of our conference, the President suggested that we go back to the officials of the Department of Defense for further conferences. We did meet with these officials.

We presented to them a number of arguments, the strongest of which, and the one which seemed to impress them the most, was our argument that their F–105 program should not be moved from Brookley unless and until such time as the F–105 was no longer needed as a firstline weapon system. We got a commitment that they would restudy the F–105 aspects of the matter, and would give us a further report. Just this week, I received a report on this from Secretary Zuckert. Although he offered me no encouragement on the matter of keeping this program at Brookley permanently, he did advise that the phaseout of the F–105 program, which had been scheduled over a 3-month period beginning in April 1966, would be stretched out over a 17-month period commencing, as scheduled, in April of 1966. I am very much encouraged by this action that the Department of the Air Force has taken. It will give us a great deal more time in which to urge even further study of this matter; and, frankly, time is what we must have at this point.

I recall that a number of years ago the Department of the Army had announced that it was closing its facilities at Huntsville. At that time, we were able to get the Army to transfer to Huntsville an extremely small and little-known unit, called the Army Missile Research Center. I do not need to go into details about how this has worked out for Huntsville. We took that small unit at Redstone Arsenal and, as our need for missiles and our space research programs grew, we built that small unit to the point where today Huntsville is known as the space capital of the world. Back in the beginning, certainly we could not know just how successful we would be in building around the Army Missile Research Center at Huntsville. We had no idea that our efforts would be so successful. Likewise, with Brookley, we cannot know at this point whether we shall be able to save the base. However, we are going to try; and if we do save it, then we plan to try to build around and upon what we save.

However, we cannot afford to put all our eggs in one basket. I have been working to find ways to ease the impact of whatever eventually happens to Brookley.

PLANNING TO EASE THE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF BROOKLEY'S CLOSING

While efforts to keep Brookley open will continue unremittingly, it would be foolish not to be making plans also at this time for the steps that can and must be taken to ease the economic impact of a Brookley closing.

It should be noted that the impact will be a heavy one for the community. The approximately 12,000 civilian employees of the Air Force who work there represent nearly 13 percent of the labor force of the city and county of Mobile. The consequences of such a large reduction in disposable income in the area as would be represented by the layoff of that many persons would reach far beyond the employees themselves.

POSITIVE ACTIONS TAKEN

If the Defense Department's scheduled phaseout of MOAMA and Brookley cannot be changed, at least four important groups in the Mobile area's economy will feel the impact painfully: First, homeowners in the area with FHA or VA mortgage payments to meet; second, Brookley's civilian employees; third, local governmental units which have incurred indebtedness for capital improvements such as schools; and, fourth, businessmen—especially small businessmen—in various circumstances. Since the 89th Congress opened in January, I have taken actions which I feel will be helpful to each of these groups.

FOR FHA AND VA HOMEOWNERS

Last year, I supported an amendment to the National Housing Act that permits the FHA Commissioner to work out agreements to hold off foreclosures on FHA homeowners who default because of circumstances beyond their control. After the Secretary of Defense announced the phaseout and eventual closing of Brookley, I knew there could be a real hardship on many homeowners in the Mobile area. In an effort to be helpful, I wrote the FHA Commissioner on February 2, 1965, to determine whether the 1964 amendment would cover those who might be affected by the eventual closing of Brookley Air Force Base. My letter to the FHA reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 2, 1965.

Mr. P. N. BROWNSTEIN,
Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWNSTEIN: You, of course, are aware from our recent conversations and previous correspondence of my concern about the decision of the Secretary of Defense affecting Brookley Air Force Base in Mobile, Ala., particularly with regard to the impact this action may have on the local housing market and upon individual homeowners in the area.

In this connection, you will recall that I was successful in amending the National Housing Act in 1964, by broadening the relief available to homeowners with FHA-insured mortgages who are in default due to circumstances beyond their control. I strongly urged the adoption of these provisions because I felt that the law then in effect was so rigid that it prevented FHA from exercising any discretion in dealing with a case where a homeowner was temporarily out of

work and unable to meet his regular monthly mortgage payments.

If I am not successful in my efforts to save Brookley Air Force Base, there will be real hardship on many homeowners in the Mobile area who are Defense Department employees "due to circumstances beyond their control."

Accordingly, I would appreciate your advising me of the extent to which the National Housing Act would offer relief to the employees of Brookley Air Force Base.

Sincerely,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

The FHA Commissioner replied on February 8, 1965, in which letter he stated:

These forbearance provisions should prove of real value to those FHA mortgagors who are in temporary financial straits because of the closing of the Brookley Air Force Base.

The Commissioner's letter reads in full, as follows:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1965.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of Tuesday, February 2, 1965, inquiring about the forbearance relief available to homeowners in the Mobile, Ala., area, who may be unable to make payments required under FHA-insured mortgages due to the announced closing of Brookley Air Force Base.

Following the enactment of the Housing Act of 1964, the FHA issued regulations which give lenders greater latitude in working with borrowers who are unable to make regularly required mortgage payments because of loss of their jobs. These forbearance provisions should prove of real value to those FHA mortgagors who are in temporary financial straits because of the closing of the Brookley Air Force Base.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of a letter to all FHA mortgagees explaining these regulations.

I have asked Mr. William Hines, the new director of the FHA insuring office in Birmingham, to work with homeowners and lenders in Mobile in every way possible to aid those mortgagors who need assistance. I am aware from our past conversations and correspondence of your vital concern in the Mobile situation. Let me reassure you that this agency, insofar as it is concerned in the housing market in Mobile, will do everything reasonably possible to help stabilize that market.

Sincerely,

P. N. BROWNSTEIN,
Commissioner.

Let me add here that the Veterans' Administration has for many years helped veteran homeowners to save their homes when they have found themselves in temporary financial straits; and I have been assured by VA officials that the same will apply to those employed at Brookley.

In addition, I have had several conversations with officials of the FHA and the VA relative to the housing market in Mobile. Officials of both agencies have assured me that they will do everything reasonably possible to help stabilize the housing market in that area, insofar as those agencies are concerned with that market.

I have also conferred with officials of the Department of Defense; the Department of the Air Force; the Civil Service Commission; the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee—Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia; and the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Senator JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, to determine what further assistance might be given to homeowners, should the base eventually be closed. These Federal agencies, as well as congressional committees, are carefully considering this question; and I hope they will find answers that will be meaningful and helpful.

In the meantime, perhaps the most harmful thing that could now occur in Mobile would be for people to panic and to put their properties on the market for sale. No one will deny that the phaseout and eventual closing of Brookley could have a severe impact on the economy of that area. However, Mobile is one of the outstanding gulf seaports, and has been for some time. I expect it to remain a thriving seaport. I personally know of many efforts to bring new economic life to Mobile. If we are successful in these efforts, that will certainly ease the impact on Mobile's economy, and likewise it will be most helpful to the housing market in that area.

FOR CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES AT BROOKLEY

On January 26, 1965, I introduced S. 728, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, so as to provide for retirement on full annuity upon voluntary separation after 30 years of service or upon involuntary separation after 20 years of service.

Under present law, a civil service employee, including a civilian employee of the Department of Defense, may retire voluntarily on full earned annuity at age 62, with 30 years of service. If retirement is involuntary and not for misconduct or delinquency, present law provides an immediate but reduced annuity if the employee has: first, 25 years of service, regardless of age; or second, 20 years of service and has attained age 50. The annuity is reduced by one-twelfth of 1 percent for each full month the age of the employee is less than 60 but not less than 55, plus one-sixth of 1 percent for each full month the age is less than 55. If neither of these conditions is met, the employee is entitled to a deferred annuity commencing at age 62, provided he does not elect a refund of his retirement deductions.

Under ordinary circumstances, these provisions are reasonable, even generous, when compared with many retirement programs found in private industry. But the Nation's defense workers and the communities in which they are concentrated are not now faced with ordinary circumstances.

My bill, S. 728, would, quite simply, eliminate the age qualification for full retirement benefits, and would retain the length-of-service qualification; that is, a civil servant voluntarily or involuntarily separated would become eligible for full earned retirement annuity, regardless of his age, after 30 years of service. He would be eligible for full annuity, regardless of age, after 20 years of service, if his separation were involuntary—occasioned, for example, by the closing of a base and not for cause, misconduct, or delinquency.

Existing civil service regulations provide:

When the location of an office or unit is changed because of decentralization, or because of the transfer of the functions of an organizational unit, and an employee is separated or resigns solely because he is unable for family or personal reasons to accompany the office or unit to its new location, the action is considered involuntary. (Para. (e) of Subchapter S–11 of Supplement 831–1 of the Civil Service Commission's Federal Personnel Manual.)

At the present time, I am also carefully studying a proposal that I introduce another bill for civil servants, providing for liberalized leave and travel allowances for employees who elect to transfer with their unit and make the move to the new location by private automobile.

FOR SMALL BUSINESS

On February 1, 1965, I introduced S. 915, a bill to amend the Small Business Act, to provide for increased eligibility for and greater utilization of the displaced-business-disaster-loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of that act.

As it presently stands, section 7(b)(3) authorizes the Small Business Administration to make so-called displaced-business-disaster loans to small concerns forced to move as a result of urban renewal, highway, or other Federal or federally assisted projects involving land condemnation. These loans differ in important respects from the usual—section 7(a)—business loans. Under a displaced-business-disaster loan, the borrower is not required to put up collateral. The loans can be made for 20 years, which is 10 years longer than under the regular business-loan program. The interest rate on the SBA's portion of such a loan can be no higher than the average annual rate on all U.S. interest-bearing obligations at the end of the last fiscal year, plus one-fourth of 1 percent. This is currently 3¾ percent. And an amount for working capital can be included in the loan.

The purpose of S. 915 is to make these highly favorable loans available to small-business concerns which have suffered substantial economic injury as a result of the actual or threatened loss, through Federal action, of a major source of employment in the area in which they are located: for example, the closing of Brookley field would make adversely affected Mobile small businesses eligible for such loans. The proceeds of these loans could be used, under my bill, for any, or a combination of, these purposes: to assist the borrower "in continuing in business at its existing location, in reestablishing its business, in purchasing a business, or in establishing a new business."

Copies of a more detailed statement about this bill that I made at the time of its introduction—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1, 1965, at page 1728—are available from my office or from the office of the Senate Small Business Committee. The statement includes information about the hearings of the Senate Small Business Committee, of which

I am chairman, during 1964 on "the impact of defense spending shifts and curtailments on small business."

FOR MOBILE'S SCHOOLS

Just this week, I introduced S. 1527, a bill to provide for a more gradual reduction in payments to local educational agencies, pursuant to Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as a result of the termination of Federal activities.

One of the manifold economic impacts on an area in which a large base is closed will be the cessation of eligibility for Federal payments in aid of school maintenance and operating costs under provisions of section 3 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress. In the most common type of situation under that section as it now stands, the law authorizes the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make Federal-aid payments to local school districts where children whose parents reside or are employed on Federal property account for more than 3 percent of all children receiving free public education in the district. The amount of such payments is computed by a formula set forth in the law.

Brookley Field provides a good example of the operation and benefits of Public Law 874. Under this statute, during the 1963–64 school year, 12 different school districts—8 in Alabama, 3 in Mississippi, and 1 in Florida—claimed children who lived on, or whose parents were employed on, the base. The total estimated entitlement of these 12 school districts, based on some 12,490 children in this category, was $1,217,785. If the situation remains approximately the same as it was during the last school year, when the phaseout is completed there will be two school districts in Alabama and two in Mississippi that will fail to meet the eligibility requirements, and the amounts payable to other districts that will remain eligible will be reduced.

Despite this fact, it is probable that many of the same children will be enrolled in the public schools of the affected districts, because their parents, even though no longer employed at Brookley or in the Federal service, will still live in the area. And it is certain that not all of the expenses of these school districts associated with their service to the children of Brookley employees will have terminated, even if the children themselves have moved away.

The purpose of the third bill in my series of adjustment measures is to provide for gradual reduction, rather than abrupt termination, of Federal payments made to a local educational agency on account of a child who has left the area or whose parent has ceased to be employed on Federal property, due to a termination of activities of the Department of Defense, such as a base closing. Under my bill, a local public school district would continue to receive credit for each child in either of these categories for 3 fiscal years after the event which, absent my proposed amendment, would have caused the loss of all credit for that child. However, the amount payable in the first fiscal year after the child's departure or change of status would be reduced to 75 percent of the full entitlement amount; to 50 percent, the second year; and to 25 percent, the third year. Thereafter, all payments for a child in this status would cease.

Another part of my bill would liberalize the existing provisions for gradual reduction of payments when a school district falls below the 3 percent—or, in some districts, the 6 percent—level of federally connected children in average daily attendance. At present, when a school district falls below the minimum percentage of federally connected enrollment for participation in the aid program, it receives, for each federally connected child in average daily attendance during the first year after that event, the full formula amount; 50 percent of the full formula entitlement per child, the second year; and nothing, thereafter.

My bill would revise this pattern, so as to permit full formula payment for each federally connected child remaining in the schools the first year after failure to meet the percentage-enrollment test; 75 percent, the second year; 50 percent, the third year; 25 percent, the fourth year; and nothing, thereafter. Hence, under my bill, a school district would benefit in two ways: It could count, for payments, children who had been, but no longer were, federally connected for a period of 3 years, on a gradually reducing basis, even if not actually in attendance. And it could, for a longer period than at present, continue to receive payments for remaining federally connected children, after it had ceased to meet the 3 percent—or 6 percent—average daily attendance test.

COMMITTEE STAFF STUDIES ORDERED

Mr. President, you may be sure that I am continuing to oppose and resist the closing of the Mobile Air Materiel Area and Brookley Air Force Base; but I shall also continue my efforts to devise and introduce proposed legislation that could be helpful in making the necessary economic adjustment if the field is closed. I have directed the professional staffs of the Senate Small Business Committee and the Senate Housing Subcommittee, both of which it is my privilege to serve as chairman, to continue their study of the many, many aspects of the economic problems associated with base closings; and I shall act promptly to implement any additional proposals that these studies may develop.

Mr. President, I believe that the legislative measure that I have introduced can, and will, be helpful, not only to Mobile, but also to any community faced with the problems of economic adjustment to a decision by the Defense Department to close any of its installations. I hope Congress will act promptly on my bills.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it stands in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

COMMUNIST INVASION OF MISSISSIPPI UNDER BANNER OF SO-CALLED "CIVIL RIGHTS" ACTIVITIES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on several occasions I spoke in this Chamber to give Senators facts about the Communist-inspired, Communist-led, and Communist-directed invasion of Mississippi under the banner of so-called "civil rights" activities.

I have gone into some detail regarding the so-called "Freedom Party" and its supporters, regarding the "Mississippi summer project" of last year, regarding the so-called "freedom riders," and regarding some or the organizations participating in the fomenting of racial violence in Mississippi and elsewhere, some of the leaders of these organizations, and some of their connections with the Communist conspiracy. Also, I have discussed some of the evidence of Communist support, both nationally and internationally, for these activities which involve magnifying racial tensions and capitalizing upon racial unrest to create violence and bloodshed, all in furtherance of the Communist objective of weakening this Nation internally to advance the day of the projected Communist takeover.

I am glad to note that the fact of Communist infiltration of the so-called "civil rights" movement is beginning to recognized outside the South. The people of Mississippi have known for 2 years or more that Communist incitement was at the bottom of most of the racial strife which has made so many headlines. This morning, under the caption "Danger From the Left," the columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak take cognizance of some of the facts which I have been reporting to the Senate from time to time.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the column to which I have just referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

DANGER FROM THE LEFT

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

While successfully forcing an emergency voting rights bill, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., surrendered valuable ground to leftist extremists in their drive for control of the civil rights movement.

The sad truth is that Dr. King at times abdicated command of the Selma, Ala., demonstration to John Lewis and James Foreman, the two hothead extremists who lead the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (usually called SNCC). And there is no doubt whatever that SNCC is substantially infiltrated by beatnik leftwing revolutionaries, and—worst of all—by Communists.

This means the civil rights movement faces an agonizing internal crisis at the hour of its greatest triumph. Unless Dr. King breaks with the SNCC extremists, liberal whites may no longer follow his leadership,

and even if he does, SNCC can create no end of trouble for the cause of Negro rights.

That's because SNCC and its leaders aren't really interested in the right to vote or any attainable goal, but in demanding the unattainable as a means of provoking social turmoil. As revolutionaries, they aren't about to stop demonstrating and pitch into the hard task of actually registering voters.

SNCC's tactics and the way Dr. King has "knuckled under" to them were illustrated painfully in Selma on March 9.

Acknowledging that the Federal courts have been the salvation of the civil rights movement, moderates wanted to obey a Federal court order banning a march from Selma to Montgomery. So did Dr. King.

But Foreman and Lewis handed the Nobel Peace Prize winner an ultimatum. Either Dr. King would lead the march or they would ignore him and lead it themselves. Rather than see leadership pulled from him, Dr. King capitulated—giving Gov. George Wallace an opening to brand the civil rights movement as contemptuous of the courts.

Dr. King had capitulated 2 weeks earlier in permitting his name to be used on a February 27 memorandum by the extremist leadership of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (which is really an offshoot of SNCC).

Implicitly referring to past civil rights legislation as "fraudulently ineffectual," the February 27 memorandum is a thinly disguised attack on moderate civil rights leadership of the kind provided by the NAACP and on the overall legislative approach to Negro rights.

The tipoff was the memorandum's demand for a voting rights bill "which will say that Federal registration will occur in any community, county, or State where the people who are not free to register request it." Such a bill without any standard for Federal intervention could not possibly be passed.

This technique of seeking turmoil rather than progress also was found in SNCC's marching orders given its followers in Washington last week—given by example when SNCC leaders lay down in the Selma street.

The order: "Lay down."

They did so inside the White House. They did so on Pennsylvania Avenue, blocking traffic in front of the White House. They did so on Capitol Hill outside Speaker McCormack's office.

Actually, Dr. King earlier this year risked incurring the wrath of SNCC extremists during the fight to unseat the Mississippi congressional delegation. Dr. King supported the position of civil rights moderates in opposing the unattainable demands that three members of the SNCC-backed Mississippi Freedom Party be arbitrarily seated in Congress.

Moreover, there is a chance Dr. King may make a clearer break with SNCC. At this writing, civil rights moderates are hoping for a statement from him renouncing the extremist memorandum of February 27.

Yet, Dr. King cannot be blamed in full for the extremists' success in the civil rights movement. In a kind of reverse McCarthyism, moderate Negro leaders, white liberals, and Government officials have feared to point out the degree of Communist infiltration. Their silence in the past may make it all the more difficult to expel extremists from the civil rights movement in the critical future.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have promised that as additional facts with respect to these matters become available to me, I shall report them publicly here, for the information of my colleagues and the people of this country. Pursuant to this promise, I have additional facts to report today.

First, let me add to what I have already said about two individuals of some local prominence in their own hometown of San Francisco, Calif.

On an earlier occasion I referred to Terry Arthur Francois, of San Francisco, as having participated in the National Lawyers Guild "task force" operation in support of the so-called "freedom party" effort to unseat duly-elected Members of Congress from my State. About all the information I had at that time, respecting Terry Arthur Francois, was that he was a Negro, a practicing attorney, and a past president of the San Francisco chapter of the NAACP. Newspaper stories later indicated Francois had expressed surprise and indignation that I had even ventured to mention his name in connection with Communist-front or other pro-Communist activities.

Now I have additional information about this man, which I am glad to share with my colleagues.

Francois was born in New Orleans, La., in August 1921. He has been active in areas of racial controversy over a period of at least some 12 or 15 years.

He has also been involved with numerous organizations and movements in the subversive field.

In 1952, he participated in the affairs of the East Bay Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. This organization was affiliated with the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which was cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated April 19, 1949.

Also in 1952, Terry Arthur Francois participated in a testimonial for the attorneys who had represented the Communists prosecuted under the Smith Act.

Terry Arthur Francois was a member of the San Francisco Fellowship of Reconciliation in 1956. The Fellowship of Reconciliation is a pacifist organization headed by A. J. Muste, who was a trusted observer at the 16th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., held February 9–12, 1957.

In 1959, Terry Arthur Francois took part in a so-called youth march for integrated schools.

Terry Arthur Francois has been frequently and favorably mentioned in the People's World, the west coast Communist newspaper. The People's World has reported his participation in the so-called San Francisco Little Summit Conference in 1960, which was characterized as follows in the 1961 Report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities:

> The purpose of the Little Summit Conference at San Francisco was to arouse popular support for the Big Summit Conference at Paris. This group of very liberal organizations—was a natural object for Communist penetration.

The People's World has reported Terry Arthur Francois' participation, in 1962, in a conference on the impact of the racial right; his activities in behalf of the bay area freedom riders' fund in 1961; his signing of a statement against the Christian anti-Communist crusade in 1962; and his activities as chairman of a SLATE seminar on the American Negro in 1962. SLATE is a leftwing student organization at the University of California.

Francois took office in 1964 as the first Negro to become a member of the board of supervisors of the city of San Francisco. He is California State chairman of the Direct Action Committee on Human Rights.

Another National Lawyers Guild task force member whom I have mentioned before is Benjamin Dreyfus, a San Francisco lawyer sometimes known as Barney Dreyfus, who was identified as a Communist Party member in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1957, and who himself claimed fifth amendment privilege before that same committee, that same year, as a basis for refusing to answer questions about his Communist Party membership.

I now have a good deal of information about Mr. Dreyfus which was not in my possession when I referred to him on an earlier occasion.

In September 1941, Benjamin—or Barney—Dreyfus was referred to by the People's World, west coast Communist newspaper, as regional secretary of the National Lawyers Guild. This reference was in a news story reporting that Dreyfus had signed an endorsement of the United Spanish Aid Committee's plan to have nations of the Western Hemisphere protect Spanish Communists in France and North Africa.

In March 1942, Dreyfus was a delegate from the National Lawyers Guild's San Francisco branch to the national Free Earl Browder Congress held at New York City. The Free Earl Browder Congress was formed to agitate for the release from prison of Earl Browder, the former executive secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A. It operated in close association with the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder, which has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

In the spring of 1942 Dreyfus signed a letter sent by the International Labor Defense to Attorney General Biddle protesting against his ruling to deport Harry Bridges, Communist labor leader.

In September of 1942 Benjamin Dreyfus was elected secretary of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, an organization which was then, as it is now, a Communist-oriented group.

In March 1943, Barney Dreyfus was back at the task of supporting Harry Bridges. According to an article in the People's World of March 4, 1943, Dreyfus signed a statement asking President Roosevelt to turn Bridges free.

In April 1943, Benjamin Dreyfus was busy fighting the so-called Dilworth bill, then pending in the California Legislature. This was a bill to bar the Communist Party from the ballot in California. Benjamin Dreyfus issued a public statement against the bill, in his capacity as secretary of the San Francisco branch of the National Lawyers Guild.

In October 1943, Benjamin Dreyfus wrote a letter to the editor of the People's World criticizing slighting references which he claimed had been made against the Fair Employment Protective

Commission and the Fair Employment Practices Commission.

Perhaps there is no chain of cause and event, but it is interesting that within less than a month after having sprung to the defense of these fair employment organizations, Dreyfus was named consultant counsel for the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice in connection with hearings on racial discrimination in shipyards in Los Angeles.

In January 1944, Benjamin Dreyfus moved up in the hierarchy of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, being elected vice president.

In May 1944, Barney Dreyfus and his wife "Babs" gave a housewarming party in their new home at 25 Belgrave Avenue, San Francisco, and extended invitations by the rather unusual device of publishing an advertisement in People's World, the west coast Communist newspaper.

In August 1945, Barney Dreyfus was named a member of the executive committee of the Bay Area American Committee for Yugoslav Relief. The national organization has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

In October 1945, Benjamin Dreyfus presided over a meeting of the San Francisco Federation of Voters Leagues at which it was decided to endorse Herbert Nugent, a Communist, as candidate for San Francisco supervisor.

In January 1945, Barney Dreyfus was named northern California secretary of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. This organization has been cited as subversive by both the House and California Committees on Un-American Activities.

In April, 1946, the People's World announced that Benjamin Dreyfus would participate in a Russian Relief American-Russian Institute forum series on "What's on Your Mind About Russia?" The American-Russian Institute has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

In June 1946, Barney Dreyfus and his wife gave another party and advertised for guests in the People's World. This time they were cohosts with a Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Foss. The party was under the auspices of the Spanish Refugee Appeal, and was for the purpose of raising money for that organization. The Spanish Refugee Appeal was organized by the Spanish Refugee Relief campaign which was cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

In October 1946, according to the People's World, the home of Benjamin Dreyfus and his wife was used for a reception for Harrison Forman, for the benefit of the China Conference Arrangements Committee. This organization has been cited as subversive by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

In December 1946, the People's World reported Barney Dreyfus as having been named as delegate to the Joint National Convention of the National Citizens Political Action Committee and the Independent Citizens Committee of Arts, Sciences and Professions, which was held in New York December 14 and 15 of 1946. The National Citizens Political Action Committee as I mentioned earlier, has been cited as subversive by both the House and California Committees on Un-American Activities.

The Independent Citizens Committee of Arts, Sciences and Professions was cited as subversive by the House Committee on un-American Activities.

On January 11, 1947, an article in the People's World referred to Benjamin Dreyfus as secretary of the National Citizens Political Action Committee for Northern California. This was in connection with an article reporting a meeting of the regional executive board of National Citizens Political Action Committee, held in Dreyfus' law office, for the purpose of making plans to build the Progressive Citizens of America in Northern California. The Progressive Citizens of America has been cited as subversive by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

On February 12, 1947, the People's World reported election of Benjamin Dreyfus as a director of the northern California chapter of the Progressive Citizens of America.

The San Francisco News of April 21, 1947, carried an advertisement listing Benjamin Dreyfus as cosigner of an advertisement sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress of San Francisco, opposing outlawing of the Communist Party. The Civil Rights Congress of San Francisco was an affiliate of the National Civil Rights Congress, which has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

On July 21, 1947, the San Francisco News reported Benjamin Dreyfus as having attended a "Wallace for President" rump-session at Fresno, Calif., on July 19 and 20 of that year. Wallace had the endorsement of the Communist press.

On June 12, 1947, the People's World referred to Dreyfus as a "labor attorney" in flattering terms, in connection with reporting him as one of the scheduled speakers in a series of roundtable discussions to be held at the California Labor School in San Francisco beginning June 13, 1947. The California Labor School was cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

In September 1947, according to the San Francisco News of September 23, the first meeting to form a San Francisco "Democrats for Wallace" group was held at Benjamin Dreyfus' office at 57 Post Street, San Francisco.

The December 8, 1947, issue of People's World carried an announcement by Benjamin Dreyfus, as acting chairman of "Democrats for Wallace," respecting a public meeting to be held December 9 at the Richelieu Hotel in San Francisco to prepare for the June primary. The announcement stated that speakers at this meeting would include Sidney Roger, Anton Refregier, and William A. P. White.

Sidney Roger was referred to in the 1948 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities as follows:

> Sidney Roger, radio commentator over radio station KGO in San Francisco is a paid functionary of the Communist Party.

Anton Refregier was the artist chosen, in 1962, to draw Christmas cards to be sold for the benefit of the Worker, national organ of the CPUSA.

William A. P. White was a sponsor of the Sidney Roger Radio Fund.

On December 10, 1947, the People's World reported Benjamin Dreyfus had been elected secretary of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers Guild for the 1948 term.

The February 10, 1948, issue of the People's World reported Benjamin Dreyfus as signer of a letter to President Truman, sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress, protesting against deportation charges against certain prominent Communists, including Alexander Bittelman and Claudia Jones. The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

Alexander Bittelman was a former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Claudia Jones was a former leader of the Communist Party, U.S.A., who was deported.

The May 18, 1948, issue of the People's World named Benjamin Dreyfus as a sponsor of the Emergency Conference on Civil Liberties, scheduled to be held at the Palace Hotel, San Francisco, on May 22, for the purpose of emphasizing the threat of the Mundt bill. The Mundt bill became known as the Mundt-Nixon bill later as the Mundt-Ferguson bill, and was a forerunner of the legislation now known as the McCarran-Walter Act, or the Internal Security Act. The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which staged this conference, has been cited as subversive by the House Committee on the Un-American Activities.

An advertisement in the San Francisco Chronicle of May 29, 1948, under the sponsorship of the Emergency Conference for Civil Liberties, carried the name of Benjamin Dreyfus as the cosigner. The purpose of this advertisement was to oppose the Mundt-Nixon bill.

In July 1948, the People's World reported Benjamin Dreyfus as a member of a delegation headed by Dr. Thomas Addis which presented the Consul-General of Spain with a resolution protesting against death sentences imposed upon eight Spanish Communists. Over the years Dr. Thomas Addis has been affiliated with a long list of Communist front organizations.

In November 1950, the People's World reported Benjamin Dreyfus as signer of a letter sponsored by the San Francisco Civil Rights Congress protesting the case of the "Los Angeles 13." The "Los Angeles 13" were 13 Communists being prosecuted under the Smith Act. They were found guilty on August 5, 1952.

In December 1948 Benjamin Dreyfus, in his capacity as Executive Secretary of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, gave the People's World a scoop on an excerpt from a statement being issued by the Guild calling for abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, according to a news story in the People's World of December 15, 1948.

Beginning in March 1949, Benjamin Dreyfus was very busy opposing anti-Communist legislation introduced in the California Legislature, including a bill

requiring a loyalty oath for State employees. These bills were known as the "Tenney" bills. Dreyfus spoke against the Tenney bills on various occasions. For example, he addressed a membership meeting of the Civil Rights Congress in San Francisco on March 25, to oppose the Tenney bills. He went up to Sacramento on May 4 to speak against the Tenney bills. On May 12, again in Sacramento, he addressed delegates to a special assembly of the California Legislative Conference, speaking in opposition to Tenney's anti-Communist legislation. The May 19, 1949, issue of the People's World listed Dreyfus as signer of a leaflet issued by the Civil Rights Congress against the Tenney bills. The June 9 issue of the People's World reported Benjamin Dreyfus as having testified against the lawyers' loyalty oath bill.

The June 22 issue of the People's World quoted Benjamin Dreyfus as having stated he would "pose the jailings of the Communist leaders by Judge Medina in New York" before the executive board of the National Lawyers Guild, San Francisco chapter.

The Daily Worker of October 19, 1949, named Benjamin Dreyfus as signer of a statement asking President Truman to dismiss the case against 11 Communists who had been convicted under the Smith Act.

In May 1951, Benjamin Dreyfus' name showed up on a letterhead as a member of the Bar Committee Against Test Oaths for Lawyers. This fight against test oaths for lawyers went on for quite a while. In March of 1951, Benjamin Dreyfus' name was on another letterhead, as sponsor of "Lawyers Against Test Oaths for the Bar."

In September 1951, a circular of the California Labor School at San Francisco named Benjamin Dreyfus as a speaker in its course "Defend Your Rights" to be held during September and October of 1951. The California Labor School has been found by the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a "Communist-front organization" within the meaning of the Internal Security Act of 1950, and ordered to register as such with the Attorney General.

In March 1952, Benjamin Dreyfus signed a letter supporting a motion to quash subpenas in the matter of 16 members of the California bar called to appear before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in Los Angeles, Calif., in April of that year. In March 1952, Benjamin Dreyfus was a vice president of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, and a member of the national executive board of the National Lawyers Guild.

According to the Daily Worker of June 19, 1952, Benjamin Dreyfus was given a standing ovation at a banquet in Los Angeles held for the purpose of honoring the lawyers who had defended the west coast Communists tried under the Smith Act.

In January 1953, the Daily Worker reported Benjamin Dreyfus as representing Morton Sobell, convicted spy for the Soviet Union, who was then in Alcatraz Prison.

That brings Benjamin Dreyfus' record down to 1953, in some detail, and with the facts about him which I discussed in a speech here last February 3, gives a fairly complete picture of his activities in connection with Communist fronts.

One of the members of the San Francisco Lawyers Guild contingent of attorneys who came into Mississippi to help stir up racial strife was Joseph R. Grodin, a graduate of the University of California, who holds an LL.B. from Yale University and practices law as a member of the firm of Nyhart and Grodin, in San Francisco, Calif. He also has an office in Oakland, Calif. The National Lawyers Guild is not Grodin's only Communist-front connection. The Daily Worker of London, which is England's Communist Party newspaper, carried an item in its February 7, 1955, issue with the headline "How American Unions are Hamstrung." This article dealt with the conference of trade union delegates sponsored by the Haldane Society, concerning the alleged effect of the Taft-Hartley Act on the American Labor movement. One of the individuals who spoke at that conference was described as "Joseph Raymond Grodin, a graduate of the University of California." The Haldane Society has been described as a Communist-front organization made up of so-called "progressive" lawyers.

One more of the radical lawyers who journeyed to Mississippi to take part in the Communist-inspired invasion of my State under the guise of "civil rights activity" was William Thornton Belcher, Jr. Belcher was one of the National Lawyers Guild contingent in the Mississippi invasion. He has been a member of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers Guild for more than 10 years, having become active in that organization soon after he was admitted to the California bar in 1950.

William Thornton Belcher, Jr., is one more example of a National Lawyers Guild "task-force" member who has a solid Communist background. He was born in 1920 in Portland, Oreg., although he now lives in Oakland, Calif., and practices law there. Belcher was a merchant seaman for some years in the early 1940's, before he got an LL.B degree from the University of California. In 1945, Belcher was a member of the Communist Party in San Francisco. He continued as a member of the party for some time thereafter, and is definitely known to have attended meetings of the Seamen's Branch of the San Francisco Communist Party in 1946. During this same period, he was contributing to the party and associating with various Communist Party members. His wife, Marian, was also a member of the Communist Party in San Francisco at that time.

Another San Francisco attorney who invaded Mississippi as a member of a National Lawyers Guild task force was Matthew J. Wadleigh. Wadleigh is a graduate of San Jose State College in California, and holds an LL.B from the University of California. He is a member of the National Lawyers Guild in San Francisco. The National Lawyers Guild has been cited as a Communist-front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Still another San Francisco lawyer who joined the Mississippi invasion at the behest of the National Lawyers Guild was Warren H. Saltzman. Saltzman holds an AB degree from the University of California and an LL.B from Yale, and is a member of the law firm of Littler, Mendelson and Saltzman, in San Francisco.

While this man Saltzman was attending the University of California in the late 1940's, he was a member of the Student Workers' Federation. This organization was formed at the University of California to serve as a recruiting establishment for the Socialist Youth League and the Worker's Party of America. The Worker's Party of America has been cited as a Communist-front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In 1948 and 1949, Warren H. Saltzman was chairman of the Progressive Citizens of America at the University of California. The California branches of this organization have been cited as Communist-controlled.

In 1962, the National Lawyers Guild set up a committee, now known as the Committee for Legal Assistance in the South—CLAS—with the purpose of sending lawyers into Mississippi and other Southern states to provide legal advice and services in so-called civil rights cases. In a report published last year, the National Lawyers Guild listed 66 lawyers as having participated in what it called its "operation in Mississippi" during the summer of 1964, and also listed 4 individuals whom it designated as "law students participating in the CLAS summer project." This is not a complete list of the Mississippi invaders recruited by the National Lawyers Guild, but it helps build the record.

I will not take time to read this list of participants in the National Lawyers Guild operation in Mississippi last summer, but I send the list forward and ask that it may be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

THE NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD OPERATION IN MISSISSIPPI: SUMMER, 1964

Number of lawyers participating: 66.
Number of case files: 45.
Number of defendants: 315.

LAWYERS PARTICIPATING IN SUMMER PROJECT

[Name, home, assignment station]

Anglin, Frank Jr., Chicago, Jackson-Greenwood, week of July 20.

Baker, Oscar W., Bay City, Hattiesburg, week of July 13.

Brocato, Justin, Kalamazoo, Biloxi, week of July 6.

Brock, Robert, Hollywood, Hattiesburg-Laurel, week of July 20.

Brown, Nelson F., Chicago, Jackson, week of August 10.

Buhai, Harriet, San Diego, Hattiesburg, week of July 27.

Carey, Thomas, Kalamazoo, Greenwood, week of July 6.

Caughlan, John, Seattle, Hattiesburg, week of August 24.

Cohn, Fred, Chicago, Meridian, week of August 10.

Craig, Roger, Detroit, Greenwood, week of August 3.

Crane, Eugene, Chicago, Hattiesburg, week of August 10.

Crockett, George W., Jr., Detroit, duration.

Culver, William, Kalamazoo, Jackson, week of July 6.

Danielski, David, Seattle, Greenwood, week of August 24.
Diggs, Anna, Detroit, Meridian-Philadelphia, week of June 22.
Dunaway, Jack, Hollywood, Hattiesburg, week of August 17.
Dunnings, Stuart J., Lansing, Meridian, week of August 3.
Enslen, Richard, Kalamazoo, Jackson, week of July 6.
Epstein, Pauline, Los Angeles, Greenwood, week of August 17.
Faulkner, Stanley, New York City, Hattiesburg, week of August 3.
Feldman, Howard, New York City, Meridian, week of August 10.
Fieger, Bernard, Detroit, Meridian, week of July 13.
Finkel, David, Los Angeles, Meridian-Columbus, week of June 22.
Fancher, Samuel, Spokane, Meridian, week of July 13.
Gostin, Irwin, San Diego, Hattiesburg-Laurel, week of July 20.
Hoffman, David, Chicago, Hattiesburg, week of August 10.
Hood, David, Seattle, Meridian, week of August 24.
Howard, Norman, Berkley, Meridian, week of August 10.
Katz, Sanford, New York City, Greenwood-Meridian, week of June 29.
Kennon, Lawrence, Chicago, Greenwood, week of August 10.
Kessler, Marvin, New York City, Meridian, week of July 6.
Kievits, Elsa, Beverly Hills, Meridian, week of July 27.
Kozupsky, Harold, New York City, Meridian, week of July 27.
Krandle, Richard, Detroit, Greenwood, week of August 24.
Langford, Anna R., Chicago, Meridian, week of August 17.
Laster, Clarence, Detroit, Meridian, week of August 3.
Lore, Harry, Philadelphia, Greenwood, week of August 17.
Loria, Donald, Detroit, Meridian-Vicksburg week of June 15.
Lynch, William, Spokane, Jackson, week of July 13.
Maki, D. William, Detroit, Jackson, week of June 29.
Markels, Charles, Chicago, Meridian-Vicksburg, week of June 15.
Maxey, Carl, Spokane, Jackson, week of July 13.
McCroskey, Jerry, Muskegon, Greenwood, week of July 20.
McGee, Henry, Jr., Chicago, Columbus, week of June 29.
Miller, Irving, Philadelphia, Greenwood, week of August 17.
Moore, Warfield, Detroit, Meridian, week of July 20.
Nier, Harry, Denver, Greenwood, week of August 10.
Omerberg, Maynard, Hollywood, Greenwood, week of July 13.
Perdix, George, Kalamazoo, Biloxi, week of July 6.
Pestana, Frank, Hollywood, Greenwood, week of July 13.
Piel, Eleanor, New York City, Hattiesburg, week of August 17.
Pontikes, George, Chicago, Hattiesburg, week of July 27.
Rossmore, William, Newark, Greenwood, week of July 20.
Shapiro, Ralph, New York City, Columbus, week of June 29.
Shropshire, Claudia, Detroit, Greenwood-Jackson, week of June 22.
Smith, Benjamin E., New Orleans, duration.
Smith, William G., Los Angeles, Hattiesburg-Greenwood, week of August 3.
Soroka, Walter, Chicago, Greenwood, week of August 10.
Sowell, Myzell, Detroit, Meridian, week of August 3.
Stein, Robert, Detroit, Greenwood, week of July 27.
Stender, Fay, San Francisco, Jackson, week of August 10.
Tuckel, Irving, Detroit, Greenwood, week of August 24.
Warren, Lawrence, Detroit, Greenwood-Jackson, duration.
Wechsler, Burton, Chicago-Gary, Meridian, week of July 20.
Wysocker, Jack, Perth Amboy, Greenwood, week of, August 10.
Zemmol, Allen, Detroit, Greenwood, week of August 3.

TOTALS BY STATES

Michigan, 23; California, 12; Illinois, 12; New York, 7; Washington, 6; New Jersey, 2; Pennsylvania, 2; Colorado, 1; Louisiana, 1.
Women participants, 8.
Negro participants, 14.
Nonguild members, 12.

LAW STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN CLAS SUMMER PROJECT

Chessler, Stephen, Northwestern University.
Johnson, George, Yale University.
McDougall, Connie, Harvard University.
Star, Michael, Georgetown University.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Henry McGee, Jr., was among those listed by the National Lawyers Guild as a participant in the CLAS summer project in Mississippi in 1964. McGee, a Negro of Chicago, Ill., is assistant prosecutor of Cook County, Ill. He is another National Lawyers Guild "task force" member with an interesting background.

Henry W. McGee, Jr., was born in 1932. In 1946, when he was 14 years old, Henry W. McGee, Jr., was reportedly a member of the International Workers Order, Lodge No. 751 at Chicago. The International Workers Order has been cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States.

The files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities reveal that one Henry W. McGee was listed as a Midwestern sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee on April 14, 1927. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee has been cited as a subversive organization pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

This Henry W. McGee was probably not Henry W. McGee, Jr., but Henry W. McGee, Sr., his father.

Henry McGee, Sr., was born in 1910. In 1946 he was a member of the IWO, and in that same year he signed a statement demanding that Claude Lightfoot, a Communist Party member who was then under indictment for violation of the Smith Act, be retained on the ballot in the general elections in Illinois. Henry McGee, Sr., was also allegedly a delegate of the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit, Mich., in 1946 and 1947. The Civil Rights Congress has been designated as Communist and subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

Last June a newsletter of the Chicago chapter of the National Lawyers Guild stated that Henry McGee, not further identified, was mentioned as having attended a meeting sponsored by the National Lawyers Guild committee for legal assistance in the South, held at Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich., on June 5 and 6, 1964. The newsletter expressed the hope that Henry "Hank" McGee would soon join the National Lawyers Guild. I do not know whether the Henry McGee referred to in this article was the father or the son.

One of the lawyers who joined in the Mississippi invasion as part of a so-called "legal task force," taking depositions to be used in the effort to unseat Mississippi Congressmen, was Robert Abram of Flint, Mich., erroneously reported in some newspaper stories as being from Detroit, Mich. Abram has been a member of the National Lawyers Guild since at least 1961. The National Lawyers Guild has long been known as a Communist front, and has been characterized by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "legal arm of the Communist Party," a conclusion which, on the basis of how the organization operates, is the plain truth. The National Lawyers Guild, since its inception, has yet to take any step prejudicial to the Communist Party, U.S.A., or its interests.

An important member of the "task force" army recruited by the National Lawyers Guild to join the invasion of Mississippi for the purpose of getting depositions to be used in support of the so-called "freedom party" effort to oust Mississippi Congressmen from their seats, was Ernest Goodman, of Detroit, Mich.

Goodman was born August 21, 1906, in Hemlock, Mich. As of April, 1964, he resided at 20146 Warrington Drive, Detroit, Mich., and was a member of the law firm of Goodman, Crockett, Eden, Robb and Philo, 3220 Cadillac Tower Building, Detroit, Mich.

Ernest Goodman was reportedly active in Communist Party-related activities from 1940 to 1964, and during the Detroit Smith Act trials in 1953, he was one of the defense attorneys. Goodman is a legal representative of the Michigan District Communist Party and is reportedly held in high esteem by Communist Party leaders. In April 1964, Goodman was the president of the National Lawyers Guild.

An identified Communist whom I have mentioned before as having participated in the general Communist infiltration of the so-called "civil rights movement" is a California lawyer named Frank Pestana. I mention him today with special reference to the Freedom Party, for he has been cited by the attorney general of Mississippi as "properly identified at the organization of the Freedom Party" and so is a subject of special interest to the people of Mississippi and to all Americans who are concerned about Communist efforts to seize power in one of the States of our Federal Union.

It is already public knowledge, and a matter of public record, that Frank Pestana was identified in 1951 as a member of the Communist Party, and specifically as a member of the lawyers group of the Communist Party in Alameda County, Calif. This identification was made by three witnesses, all under oath. It is also public knowledge, and a matter of public record, that in October 1952 Pestana

claimed fifth amendment privilege before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in refusing to respond to questions regarding his Communist Party affiliations, and that Pestana was identified by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, in its 1963 report, as a member of the "legal panel consisting of lawyers who offer their services in behalf of those members of the Communist Party and fellow-travelers who may become embroiled with the law."

I now have additional information about Frank Pestana which ought to be made public.

Frank Pestana was born March 2, 1913, at Porto Santa in the Madeira Islands, Portugal. He was naturalized as a citizen of the United States in February 1937 in Alameda County, Calif. He lives in a fine home in Mulholland Drive in Los Angeles, Calif.

Pestana was an illegal visitor to Cuba in May of 1962. When called before the House Un-American Activities Committee at a hearing on illegal travel to Cuba, Pestana was accompanied by his wife as "temporary counsel," and in turn acted as "temporary counsel" for her. Both of them refused to answer questions asked by the committee. When they came before the committee again in Washington in 1963, Frank Pestana claimed fifth amendment privilege in refusing to answer questions about going to Cuba, while his wife admitted making the trip.

Pestana's wife whose name is Jean Estelle, also has been identified as a member of the Communist Party. Two witnesses have sworn under oath that she was a member of the Lawyers Club of the Los Angeles County Communist Party in the late 1940's.

Like her husband, Mrs. Pestana also participated in the so-called "freedom riders" activity in Mississippi.

Jean Pestana spoke at a meeting sponsored by the Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born in Los Angeles, about the first of September 1961, on the subject of "freedom riders." This meeting, reported by the National Guardian in its issue of September 4, 1961, at page 7, was held at the Hungarian Workman's Home Society hall, at 1251 South Street, Andrews Place, Los Angeles, Calif. Mrs. Pestana's cospeaker was Rosie Rosenberg, at the time head of the California Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born. Mrs. Rosenberg also was a fellow-traveler with the Pestanas on their illegal trip to Cuba in 1962.

Jean Pestana spoke again at the Hungarian Workman's Home Society hall in Los Angeles on July 26, 1963, and again her subject was "freedom riders" but this time she was talking about her own visit to Mississippi. This meeting in July of 1963 was under the sponsorship of an organization called the "Free Press Forum."

The Free Press Forum appears to be successor to an organization known as "The Downtown Club" which was cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as one of the four major Communist fronts in Los Angeles. Several of the same persons who were leaders of the The Downtown Club are active in the Free Press Forum, including Naomi Blair and Matilda Tolly, both of whom have been cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Naomi Clair Blair invoked the first and fifth amendments during testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in September 1958, as a basis for refusing to answer questions respecting her membership in the Communist Party. After being told that the House Committee on Un-American Activities had received information that she was a member of the Zapata Section of the Communist Party, Mrs. Blair refused to deny this, but invoked the first and fifth amendments as a basis for refusing to answer whether the report was true.

According to the file of Stephanie Horvath, a New York police informant, Naomi Blair was on the membership list of the United Nations Club of the Communist Party and was also on the membership list of the Yorkville Club of the Communist Party.

Matilda Tolly testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities at its hearings regarding Southern California District of the Communist Party on February 25, 1959, and invoked the fifth amendment various times in refusing to answer questions. Such questions included whether she had at any time used the name of Hilda Knox, whether she joined the Communist Party in Los Angeles in 1933 under the name of Hilda Knox, and various other questions about her membership in the Communist Party. These were two of the leaders of the group under whose auspices Mrs. Jean Pestana spoke in Los Angeles last July.

In the course of this talk before the so-called free press forum, Jean Pestana said she had been arrested on several occasions while in Mississippi, but did not mention specifically any town except Jackson where such an arrest had taken place.

After declaring that: "Personally I do not subscribe to nonviolence," Mrs. Pestana told her audiencce that she and Mrs. Rosenberg had "acted like respectable ladies" on the trip from Los Angeles to Jackson, Miss., and were "very careful to cause no trouble en route" because "we wanted to focus our efforts on Jackson." Whether she intended the implication that she and Mrs. Rosenberg did not "act like respectable ladies" after they got to Jackson, or whether this was an unconscious revelation of her state of mind, is a point on which I am not informed.

Now let me leave the area of lawyers and legal task forces, and give attention to some of the new-generation participants in the conspiracy to stir up civil disorder in the South.

One of the young radicals who has joined in the invasion of Mississippi as an alleged "freedom fighter" is John Tillotson, a native of Aberdeen, S. Dak. Tillotson presently gives his mail address as "Freedom House" in Ruleville, Miss., and has been working for the Council of Federated Organizations there. This freedom house in Ruleville is one of a large number of so-called "freedom houses" being established in different towns in Mississippi, and they are all Communist indoctrination centers.

Young Tillotson—he was born in 1943—has quite an interesting record. After graduating in 1961 from Anoka High School in Anoka, Minn., with a high scholastic record, he entered the University of Minnesota. As of January this year, he was still reportedly a student at the University of Minnesota, majoring in child psychology.

This young man has been known to his classmates as a radical ever since his high school days. He has attended various Communist Party functions. He is known as an active youth organizer and has been interested in having Communist Party functionaries, such as Gus Hall, come to the University of Minnesota to address the student body.

According to articles in the February and June 1962, issues of the Minnesota Daily, which describes itself as a student newspaper at the campus of the University of Minnesota, Tillotson was elected to the position of chairman of the Minnesota Student Peace Union for the 1962–63 school year. These articles identified Tillotson as one of two University of Minnesota students who would represent the university at what the articles described as the largest student demonstration in 20 years. The demonstration was described as a student peace lobby focusing on atmospheric nuclear testing and civil defense. The students did conduct the peace march in Washington, D.C., during the weekend prior to February 20, 1962, at which time proposals were presented to then President Kennedy, to Members of Congress, and to foreign embassies, as well as being distributed on the campus of the University of Minnesota by the student peace union. The major proposal was that the United States reject atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons and that the United States refuse nuclear weapons to nations not already having such weapons. Another proposal was that the U.S. Government withdraw its missile bases in areas such as Turkey and Italy. The student group also proposed that the United States "disengage" in central Europe, and described the current civil defense program in the United States as essentially useless.

In August 1962, or shortly before then, the Student Peace Union published a pamphlet entitled "Be Sure You Know This About ROTC." This was a sort of handbook designed to deter new students at the University of Minnesota from enrolling in the ROTC program. The pamphlet pointed out that such enrollment was not required, and was highly critical of the ROTC program.

In October 1962, young Tillotson participated in a demonstration on the campus of the University of Minnesota expressing the opposition of the Student Peace Union to President Kennedy's action in the Cuban crisis.

Another article in the Minnesota Daily in November 1962, indicated that Tillotson had described the Student Peace Union as an organization dedicated to the idea that war, especially nuclear war, "won't solve anything." This article also indicated Tillotson had

claimed the purpose of the Student Peace Union was to promote education and action to end the arms race, and that he had emphasized that not all members of the Student Peace Union are pacifists. The July 24, 1962, issue of the Minnesota Daily carried an article identifying Tillotson as one of six students to attend the eighth World Festival of Youth and Students in Helsinki, Finland, from July 23 to August 6, 1962. This Helsinki youth festival was a Communist-propaganda manipulation.

Not only did Tillotson go to the Communist youth festival in Helsinki, but he went there as a member of a group who traveled on a special KLM flight and subsequently toured the U.S.S.R. and the German Communist Republic. The national youth director of the CPUSA, Daniel Rubin, met with this group prior to their departure and may have had something to do with their selection.

Tillotson's activities in Mississippi are not his first adventure into the field of racial violence. He was arrested on July 4, 1963, on a charge of trespassing, in connection with a so-called "civil rights" demonstration at Gwynn Oak Park in Maryland. There were about 300 participants in that demonstration, the purpose of which was to protest the alleged "segregation policy" of Gwynn Oak Park, which is an amusement park in the Baltimore area. Newspaper articles describing this demonstration and Tillotson's arrest referred to him as a counselor at Camp Midvale, N.J.

There is more which could be said about young Tillotson if security reasons did not prevent it. He is an outstanding example of a second-generation Communist-in-prospect. In fact, he might even be called third generation. His father was a Communist; his mother was a Communist; his grandmother was a Communist; and under this influence, young Tillotson is moving in the direction of becoming a Communist cadre.

Walter Hoads, of Cambridge, Mass., a student at Harvard College, is another of the young second-generation radicals who joined the Mississippi invasion last year.

Young Hoads was born in December 1943 at Philadelphia, Pa. He was a junior at Harvard College last year. In July 1964, while he was working in Greenwood, Miss., for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, his home address was listed at 864 West End Avenue, New York City. His parents are Dr. Robert Hoads and Jane B. Hoads of that address.

Dr. Hoads' Communist Party membership goes back to at least 1943, when he was a member of the professional section of the Communist Party of eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware. In the fall of 1954, he went to Peiping, China, where he was employed by the Chinese Medical Association as a research scientist until 1959. Dr. and Mrs. Hoads and their children lived in Peiping, China, for about 5 years until late 1958. They returned to the United States in December 1959, after visiting the Soviet Union. Dr. Hoads is presently research assistant in pediatrics at Mount Sinai Hospital, New York City. He is reported as still active in Communist Party affairs. He attended the founding meetings of the American Institute for Marxist Studies, New York City, in December 1963 and January 1964. He was listed as a founding sponsor on the letterhead of the American Institute for Marxist Studies.

Mrs. Jane Hoads, mother of Walter Hoads, also has an extensive record of membership and affiliation with the CPUSA.

Another second-generation radical who joined the Mississippi invasion as part of the so-called "summer project" in 1964 was Steven Roy Miller of San Francisco, Calif. Young Miller covers a lot of ground. His home is in San Francisco. He was in Mississippi last summer. He is, or at least was until recently, listed as a student at Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio. He has also been reported as working for CORE in the New Orleans area.

Steven Miller is the son of Hugh and Helen Miller, who live at 355 Roosevelt Way, San Francisco, Calif. Hugh Miller is an attorney. From 1945 to 1951, Hugh Miller was a member of the professional section of the Communist Party in San Francisco. Helen Miller was reportedly a member of the Communist Party from 1937 to 1950. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Miller have been reported still active in Communist Party front groups in the San Francisco area.

One more of the young radicals who joined the Mississippi invasion as part of the Mississippi summer project last year was Barry Andrew Goldstein of East Meadow, N.J.

Barry Andrew Goldstein was born October 7, 1942, at New York City, to Isadore Goldstein and Ruby Pistrack. He was graduated from Harvard University on June 11, 1964, just before he left for Mississippi.

Isadore Goldstein, father of Barry Andrew Goldstein, was a partner of convicted atom spies Julius Rosenberg and Bernard Greenglass in the early part of 1946. The partnership operated a machine shop known as the G. & R. Engineering Co. Goldstein lived in an apartment building in Knickerbocker Village located diagonally across from the one in which Julius Rosenberg lived, and some distance away. It appeared that Goldstein's main interest in the G. & R. Engineering Co. was to maintain the records of the company. Goldstein's interest was bought out by Rosenberg and Greenglass in the summer of 1947, when the latter two individuals decided to form the Pitt Machine Products Co. and wanted to take in another partner.

One of the so-called "freedom riders" who took part in the invasion of Mississippi at an early stage was a woman named Del Greenblatt, whose residence is 47–30–61st Street, Woodside, N.Y. Del Greenblatt was arrested in Jackson, Miss., in June 1961, in connection with activities of the freedom riders. She has been reported as now or recently a student at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. An interesting bit of information about Del Greenblatt is that her post office box address—Post Office Box 115, Woodside, N.Y.—is the box used by the University Committee To Protest the War in Vietnam.

The University Committee To Protest the War in Vietnam was the sponsor of a large advertisement—10 by 18 inches—in the New York Times of February 28, 1965, at page 10E. This ad carries the names of a significant number of individuals who have impressive Communist-front records, including Ephraim Cross of the City College of New York, Corliss Lamont of Columbia University, Robert F. Lynd of Columbia University, Helen Merrill Lynd of Sarah Lawrence College, Doxey A. Wilkerson, teacher of educational psychology at Yeshiva University in New York, K. H. Niebyl of the New School for Social Research, Paul M. Sweezy, economist, and H. H. Wilson of Princeton University.

The ad listed Miss Del Greenblatt as cotreasurer of the committee and referred to her as a history teacher at Queens College, N.Y.

Another volunteer invader of Mississippi under the so-called "civil rights" banner who has a pro-Communist record is an NAACP member named Alfred Baker Lewis of Old Greenwich, Conn.

Lewis has almost made a career out of criticizing the Federal Bureau of Investigation, particularly with regard to the Bureau's alleged lack of investigative activity in the civil rights field. It is my understanding that Lewis, who reportedly inherited $2 million from his grandmother in 1938, ran several times as Socialist candidate for Governor of Massachusetts, and was arrested twice as a participant in protest meetings on behalf of Sacco and Vanzetti in 1927.

The files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities contain numerous references to Alfred Baker Lewis in connection with his association with several organizations cited by the Department of Justice and other governmental agencies during the past 20 to 30 years, such as the National Negro Congress, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, the National Citizens Political Action Committee, the American Fund for Public Service—Garland Fund—a Communist foundation, and the Greater Boston Peace Strike Committee.

Still another NAACP member who in Mississippi supporting the so-called civil rights activities of the self-styled freedom riders is Dr. Claude Hudson, a Negro dentist. He lives in Los Angeles, Calif. In 1946, Dr. Claude Hudson participated in a panel discussion at a meeting held at the Los Angeles City College Auditorium, which was sponsored by the Mobilization for Democracy, an organization cited as Communist and subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In that same year, also, Dr. Hudson was allegedly associated with the Hollywood Independence Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. This organization was an affiliate of the Hollywood Independence Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Dr. Hudson was also associated in 1946 with the National Committee to Win the Peace, which has been cited as a Communist front by the Attorney General of the United States.

Still another Mississippi invader under the so-called civil rights banner was Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld, of Cleveland, Ohio. The name of Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld has appeared several times in connection with public appeals and petitions by the Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell. Morton Sobell was a codefendant of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, convicted atomic spies who were executed in June 1953.

Mr. President, the Mississippi invasion is being broadened in scope, and this is not a case of an indigenous local movement fanning out into adjacent territory. Plans for this operation were carefully laid. The invasion of Mississippi was one phase, and that is continuing. But the operation is going forward elsewhere as planned. Long before recent events gave the appearance of new and allegedly spontaneous outbreaks of racial violence in new places in the South, it had already been determined where this new violence would be fomented. There is nothing more spontaneous about these outbreaks of racial violence and civil disorder than there is about the landing of any invading force on a foreign shore.

One of the recent conclaves to chart the progress of plans for producing racial incidents and demonstrations throughout the South, and to make further plans, was held last February 11 to 16 in Atlanta, Ga. This was a meeting of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. About 250 staff members of SNCC attended, most of them from Southern States, but there were also representatives from New York, Chicago, and other parts of the country. Besides the staff members, there were about 200 so-called students, all Negroes, from various Southern States. Among those attending this conference were about 100 from Mississippi. Much of the time at this conference was devoted to planning programs for next summer in various States of the South, and particular emphasis was laid on what the planners called their "Black Belt Project," which calls for activities in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, and Louisiana, as well as in Mississippi.

This planning for future invasions of southern communities was done at staff meetings which were under strict security, with only staff members allowed to attend.

It is perhaps significant that almost one-third of those present at this conference wore beards. Some of those who wore them were heard to state that these beards were directly connected with the Castro movement and were symbolic of that movement, and several of the beardwearers declared they would not shave until the revolution was successful.

In view of what has been taking place recently in Selma, Ala., it is worth mentioning that one of those who attended this conference was a Negro who stated that as soon as the Atlanta meeting was over, he was going to Selma, Ala.

Mr. President, in previous speeches I have talked about some of the organizations under Communist control or influence which are active in the so-called civil rights field. One of the newer ones, and one which I have not yet discussed here, is the African-American Heritage Association, which has its headquarters in Chicago. The head man of the African-American Heritage Association, Chicago, is one Ishmael Pierre Flory. This man has been a Communist Party member, both local and national, since 1935. He is in the public relations business, operating a firm called Ishmael Flory Associates at 306 East 43d Street, Chicago. Besides public relations, the firm also deals in advertising, printing, mimeographing, and insurance.

Ishmael Pierre Flory is a Negro, believed to have been born in July 1907 at Lake Charles, La., although there are no records to verify his birth. During Flory's career as an active member of the Communist Party, he has occupied various positions in the party. He has also been active in numerous Communist Party front groups cited as subversive by the Department of Justice.

Besides holding the title of "director of organization" of the African-American Heritage Association at Chicago, Flory is also one of the founders of this organization. In its articles of incorporation, filed with the Secretary of State of Illinois in October 1958, the African-American Heritage Association stated the purposes of the organization as being "to spread wide and far the history and heritage of people of African descent to Negroes and the whole American people."

The African-American Heritage Association is strongly influenced by the Communist Party of Illinois, and has Communists on its governing board.

Ishmael Flory appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities at Washington, D.C. in November 1961, and at that time pleaded the 1st, 5th, 14th, 15th, and 19th amendments to the U.S. Constitution in declining to answer questions propounded to him by the committee.

The exact position presently occupied in the Communist Party by Ishmael Pierre Flory is not known to me. But it is certain he is well regarded by the party's hierarchy. In December 1963, Claude Lightfoot, one of the leading spokesmen of the Communist Party of Illinois, named Flory as a potential member for a new Negro commission for the Communist Party of Illinois.

The Afro-American Heritage Association of Chicago is known for its active cooperation with the Communist press in support of a project known as Negro History Week.

Mr. President, in earlier speeches I have spoken of the support being given by Communist Parties and leaders abroad to the forces engaged in racial agitation in this country. Let me now supplement what I have said in this regard with a few more facts.

Last August the Chinese Communists organized a mass rally in Peiping which they described as "in support of U.S. Negroes and in commemoration of the first anniversary of Mao Tse-tung's statement in support of U.S. Negroes' struggle against racial discrimination." Speaking at this rally, the vice chairman of the Red Chinese Political and Legal Affairs Committee, Wu Te-feng, recited that a year previously Mao Tse-tung, Red Chinese dictator, had issued a call for world Communist support of the U.S. Negroes in their "struggle," and declared:

> No sooner was Chairman Mao's statement made public * * * than 250,000 Negroes and their sympathizers carried out a large-scale march in Washington. In the past year, the U.S. Negro movement has become deeper and deeper and broader and boarder. Next year, their struggle against racial discrimination will almost assuredly reach new height.

Wu quoted Mao Tse-tung as having stated:

> The speedy development of the struggle of the American Negro is a manifestation of the sharpening class struggle and national struggles within the United States.

He quoted Mao as saying:

> More and more of the Negro masses have come to realize * * * that only by uniting and carrying out struggle can they hope to enjoy the rights they deserve.

Another speaker at the rally, Quo Chien, a member of the Secretariat of the Red Chinese National Women's Federation, declared:

> Every struggle waged by the Negroes and every victory achieved by them in the United States, the chief bulwark of imperialism, constitutes great support to the other peoples in the world in their struggle against imperialism headed by the United States.

Declaring that "American Negroes have come to see ever more clearly in their struggle to win freedom and emancipation [that] it was essential to wage a tit-for-tat struggle against the reactionary rule of U.S. monopoly capital," Quo Chien declared American Negroes had been "forced" to "rise in battle" and asserted that "armed self-defense" was "the unalienable, sacred right of the Negro people." Another speaker at the rally, Peter H. Raboroko, educational secretary of the Pan-Africanist Congress of South Africa, said the Negro question in the United States "will be solved only when the present U.S. society has been completely overhauled." This South African Negro said:

> Today the Negro people of the United States of America dare to fight. Today they are using rocks, clubs, and bottles as means of self-defense.

And he declared:

> They are now ready to meet violence with violence, counterrevolutionary violence with revolutionary violence.

One of the self-expatriate American Communists who are today serving the world Communist conspiracy in other countries is Virginius Frank Coe. Coe, who was a protege of the Communist agent, Harry Dexter White, in the days when White was one of the most powerful men in the U.S. Treasury Department, now is working for the Chinese Communists in Peiping. At the Peiping rally last August 18, Coe made a speech about racial violence in the United States. After declaring that Mao Tse-tung's call for Communist support of American Negroes in their struggle against "the racial discrimination practiced by U.S. imperialism" was "widely circulated among the American Negroes,

despite the efforts of the U.S. capitalistic press to suppress it," Coe went on to say that "every national liberation struggle in the world has declared that the struggle of the Afro-Americans is part of their own cause. So have all the Marxist-Leninist parties and groups in the world."

Negro leaders in the United States, Coe declared, "are reaching out to form links with the national liberation struggle throughout the world." Translated from Communist jargon, that means Coe charged U.S. Negro leaders with seeking aid and support from all parts of the Communist world empire.

The current invasion of Mississippi is backed by Communist Cuba, as strongly as by Communist China. Castro's regime both directly from Cuba and through its propaganda and espionage machine in this country, has been backing the so-called "Freedom" program as it has backed other so-called "civil rights" activities and sought to develop them into racial violence.

One of the northern invaders who came to Mississippi this past summer as part of the so-called Mississippi summer project was Joanne Grant. Though she was in Jackson on some occasions, she spent most of her time in Greenwood, and after she got back, wrote an article about her experience for the National Guardian, a publication which, while not Communist-controlled, is definitely pro-Communist. Joanne Grant was secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee in 1960, and in July of that year she took the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions about her activities in connection with that committee and about her membership in the Communist Party. Joanne Grant was identified as a member of the Communist Party in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on February 3, 1960.

Cuba's Communist dictator, Fidel Castro, began working for the incitement of racial violence in this country as soon as he came to power in Cuba. More than 4 years ago Castro agents were distributing among Negro leaders in the South, and in some other parts of the United States as well, leaflets printed in both Spanish and English, calling for "emancipation" of Negroes in the United States. In succeeding months, other forms of revolutionary propaganda were directed to Negro organizations and leaders in the South and in New York City, through the mails from Havana. More recently, copies of a mimeographed bulletin written by Robert Williams, bearing the name "The Citadel," and describing the alleged need for Negroes to battle for freedom, have been transmitted through Canada to selected Negro leaders in this country.

When the close ties between Cuba and Red China were evidenced anew, propaganda radio in Peiping reported on last September 18 that this same Robert Williams and his wife had left Havana that day to fly to Peiping to "attend the celebrations of the 15th anniversary of the founding of the Peoples Republic of China and pay a friendship visit to China at the invitation of the China Peace Committee." This Red Chinese radio report said that Williams and his wife "were seen off at the airport"—at Havana—by Wang Yu-pin, Chinese Ambassador to Cuba, and his staff.

This Robert F. Williams, renegade American Negro, who has broadcast regularly from Cuba on a program called "Havana Free Dixie," and who had debased himself in other notorious ways, is one of Castro's most effective provocateurs of racial violence in the United States.

Williams, a self-expatriate, is a sort of Cuban-Communist version of the Second World War's Lord Haw Haw. In a program beamed to the United States on August 8 of last year, after viciously characterizing white men as "Ofay Devils" who have "gone stark raving mad," and declaring the white man is "a habitual liar, a great deceiver, a vicious conspirator, and a brutal racist hypocrite, a megalomaniac who thinks he is the Supreme Being and God of the entire universe," Williams issued the following "call to arms":

> We are injured by racial injustice. Let the thug cop and the racist savages view our indignation through the razor, the lye can, the gas bomb, and the bullets. Let those who despise us and brutally oppress our people be prepared to kill or be killed. Let our people take to the streets in fierce numbers and let our battle cry be heard around the world: Freedom, freedom, freedom, now, or death.

Of course Russia, Cuba, and China are not the only sources of Communist efforts toward the fomentation of racial violence in the United States. Evidence of these efforts is being brought to light through various channels.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, who besides being vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, said on August 13, 1964, in releasing a report on a 3-year investigation by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee into mail order purchases of firearms, that a "roaring stream" of surplus small arms from Communist nations was flooding the United States. Senator DODD reported that "untold millions of mail-order arms, virtually all of them surplus, are being peddled to all comers at a time of great national tension."

Senator DODD said that "private military groups have stockpiled weapons," and declared that Malcolm X, the Black Nationalist leader, since assassinated, had warned that his people "are prepared for a small civil war." There is reason to believe that the killing of Malcolm X may have been part of a power struggle for top leadership in this "small civil war."

Communist influence in recent riots and racial demonstrations in different parts of this country could have been discerned without knowing the name of a single participant, simply from an analysis of the techniques which were used.

Over 3 years ago, the Internal Security Subcommittee took testimony from the Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency respecting Communist plans to undermine police authority.

Describing the theme which he said Communist organizers were instructed to teach and use in developing crowd violence, the witness said these included allegations that the police were distrusted by the people; that the enlisted personnel of the police were ill-treated; and that police officers were incompetent; that the police force was basically a "representative force," not interested in justice, but only in serving its masters.

Hand-drawn illustrations taken from a notebook seized from a known Communist organizer were put into our record. These drawings demonstrate how Communist agitators are taught that crowds should be deployed in order to frustrate police control, and what tactics should be used to break through police lines. The drawings showed where "squad leaders" should be placed, and the positions which should be taken by control officers leading the riot, in order to best exercise their authority, and not only whip up the crowd to violence, but also direct the mob activity most effectively against police resistance.

A study of recent racial outbreaks and violent demonstrations showed that in instance after instance crowd movements fitted the pattern laid down in this Communist organizer's notebook, the classic Communist pattern of incited violence under Communist control.

The Communist pattern for crowd violence has appeared on the east coast, it has appeared on the west coast, it has appeared in the South.

During the racial riots in Harlem at the end of last July, a New York City detective of Puerto Rican descent went to a secret Harlem meeting carrying a concealed tape recorder, and heard William Epton, a self-described Communist and head of the Harlem Defense Council, call for the killing of policemen and judges.

This policeman made a tape recording of Epton telling the meeting:

> The State must be smashed. We're going to have to kill cops and judges.

On June 19, 1964, two top Communist leaders in New York City were photographed as they were attending a protest rally at which Communist Jesse Gray called for "guerrilla warfare" to stop alleged police brutality.

This Jesse Gray, a Harlem Negro hoodlum, who, in addition to leading Negro rioting in New York City, has made repeated public calls for "guerrilla warfare" by Negroes, and who has declared that this call for "guerrilla warfare" was intended for Mississippi, was identified as a Communist Party member more than 4 years ago in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Testifying before the same committee on the same day, Gray himself declared he was not "now" a Communist Party member; but Gray took the fifth amendment to avoid answering questions about his previous membership in the party.

The testimony reveals that Jesse Gray and Ben Davis, then New York State Communist Party chairman, devised a picket program for young Communists in the summer of 1958, and tried to put the scheme into effect immediately by organizing a picket line around the 23d

precinct police station in Harlem, to protest the shooting of a Negro by a policeman in the Bronx. According to the sworn testimony, Gray and Davis instructed the prospective pickets that they should refuse to move in response to police orders, because "it would be a big incident and this will be a good political advantage for the Communist Party."

On July 22, 1964, when I spoke in the Senate to emphasize the problem of Communist infiltration into the so-called civil rights movement, I named certain individual Communists involved in this movement and I have since named others. It is also a matter of record that this penetration is being carried out not only by individual Communists, but also by organizations which are tax exempt and operated by individuals who are Communists. Let me give one example.

The Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation, with offices at 120 East 16th Street, New York, N.Y., was incorporated in the State of Delaware in 1944. Its president is Victor Rabinowitz, who has appeared as a witness before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities on a number of occasions. On each occasion he invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to testify regarding his Communist Party membership. On the board of the Rabinowitz Foundation, along with Victor Rabinowitz, is Marcia Rabinowitz, his wife, and Mrs. Lucille Perlman, his sister.

Anne Braden, editor of the Southern Patriot, the official organ of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, wrote a letter to James Dombrowski, executive director of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, under date of February 20, 1963. Referring to proposed racial agitation in the name of "civil rights," she recommended that "When a budget is drawn up for this, I think we should try to get a grant from the Rabinowitz Foundation." She added that the foundation people "are getting ready to give SNCC some money."

A letter from the Southern Conference Educational Fund dated March 7, 1960, addressed to the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation, Inc., attention of Mrs. Mary Jane Keeney, administrative secretary, shows the Southern Conference Educational Fund was then negotiating with the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation for aid in setting up a speaker's bureau to service southern colleges.

The late Aubrey Williams, then president emeritus of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, in a telegram to Mrs. Mary Jane Keeney, solicited help from the foundation for a grant to Don West, a well-known Communist poet.

Mary Jane Keeney invoked the fifth amendment with regard to her Communist Party membership when she appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on February 18, 1952.

Testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on May 24, and 25, and June 9, 1949, showed that Mrs. Keeney and her husband, Philip O. Keeney, both former U.S. Government employees, had association with persons previously identified with Soviet espionage rings in this country. Evidence also showed that Mrs. Keeney at one time served as a courier for the Communist Party.

Victor Rabinowitz is an attorney who represented the Communist government of Cuba in a case before the U.S. Supreme Court in 1963, and who is registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as an agent of the Castro government. His partner is Leonard Boudin, another top Communist Party lawyer. Rabinowitz signed an amicus curiae brief in 1950 in behalf of the 11 Communist leaders on trial at that time. In 1962, he was an attorney for Joanne Grant, who is active in racial matters in the South, and who appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on October 10, 1960, and invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions regarding her Communist affiliations.

The daughter of Victor Rabinowitz, named Joni Rabinowitz, who has been a student at Antioch College, was charged with perjury in Albany, Ga., in November 1963. She has been active in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and attended the Eighth World Youth Festival, a Communist propaganda operation, in 1962–63. Her conviction on the perjury charge has been appealed.

Mr. President, I have taken up a number of different points, but they are all aspects of a single subject. That subject is the determined effort now being made, with Communist support and in line with Communist planning, to escalate the so-called civil rights problem into a major racial conflict which will shake the Nation, divide the sovereign States one against another, and create conditions favorable to what the Communists call a "national revolution."

Mr. President, the people of Mississippi have borne the brunt of the battle up to now. Mississippi has been the focal point of the Communist drive for Negro revolution in this country. And although, as I have pointed out, the plans for the months ahead which have been made, and which are being made, by the Communists and those they manipulate, call for spreading their poison over a wider area, and lighting new fires of racial disorder in other Southern States, Mississippi will continue as the focal point of the struggle. The Communists know, and Communist leaders have stated publicly, that they cannot succeed with their program of racial demonstrations on a national basis unless they can succeed in Mississippi. The people of Mississippi therefore bear a double burden. On their stanchness of faith, their determination, and their fortitude to resist this invasion from outside their borders depends not only their own future and the future of their State, but also, in a very real sense, the future of their country.

I know the people of Mississippi, and I thank God that my knowledge of these people and of their character, and of the strength of their beliefs, gives me confidence that the people of Mississippi will not faint in the heat of the battle. Their courage will not ooze away. They will not become discouraged to the point where they throw in the sponge. They will not quit. And some day, Mr. President, the people of this Nation will come to realize what they owe to the people of Mississippi, and to the people in other areas of the South who are now being called upon, or who may soon be called upon, to resist in their own communities the forces of racial hatred and violence and civil disorder which have been unleashed in the name of civil rights but which serve most effectively the purposes and the objectives of the world Communist conspiracy.

VIETNAMESE POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a few items I wish to insert in the RECORD and make brief comments thereon.

I have been speaking with considerable frequency for more than a year now on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere in the country in opposition to U.S. outlawry in southeast Asia. I have pointed out in these speeches that, in my judgment, we are acting completely outside the framework of international law. I repeat the charges tonight.

However, my speech for today really was made for me in Walter Lippmann's column this morning. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's column be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

VIETNAMESE POLICY REEXAMINED

(By Walter Lippmann)

The time cannot be far off when there will have to be a serious reappraisal of our policy in Indochina. Before saying any more about this, let me say at once that this does not mean that we can or should withdraw our troops, abandon our clients in Saigon, retire from the theater and give up the effort to safeguard the independence of the Indochinese states. The reappraisal of our present policy is necessary, I submit, because the policy is not working and will not work. It will have to be reappraised in order to avert disaster—the disaster of our expulsion from the area, leaving China supreme over it, and the disaster also of an escalation to a Chinese-American war.

The stated aim of our current policy is to persuade Hanoi to call off its intervention in South Vietnam and to agree to an international conference. The success of the policy depends on a highly theoretical assumption: that we can find a point where our measured blows will not be so strong that they precipitate "a wider war"—a North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam or the entrance of a Chinese army into Indochina. But while the bombing must not be so heavy as to precipitate the wider war, it must be heavy enough to compel Hanoi to give up the struggle in which it is engaged. There are no signs that we are anywhere near finding this quite imaginary point between not too much and just enough bombing. The civil war in South Vietnam is going from bad to worse despite the bombing in North Vietnam. In fact the military situation has never been so bad as it is now.

In my view, the bombing policy is not working because it is only half a policy. It is half baked. Or, to change the metaphor, it is all stick and no carrot. We are telling the North Vietnamese that they will be very badly hurt if they do not quit. And we make these bombing raids to convince them that we have bombs and know how to drop them. But we are not telling the North Vietnamese what kind of future there would

be for them and the rest of Indochina if the war ended as we think it should end.

Our present policy lacks the essential element of a true policy when armed adversaries confront each other. The missing ingredient is a sketch of the settlement which our military effort is designed to bring about.

As our objective has been stated in the glossy generalities of the President and in the deliberately obscure language of Secretary Rusk, we are offering Hanoi a choice between destruction and military withdrawal. Because the military terms we are demanding have not been defined, they amount in fact to another version of unconditional surrender. Nothing has been said publicly, and so far as I am aware, nothing has been said privately, as to how things should be, or could be, arranged if Hanoi, in fact, did quit.

It should not surprise us moreover that the policy is not working. The measured bombing, measured to be short of precipitating a wider war, does not deter or compel Hanoi. The punishment they are suffering is tolerable and can be absorbed. On the other hand, the demand that Hanoi quit supporting the Vietcong falls on deaf ears. For the Vietcong is winning the war, and the time may be not far off when a coup in Saigon will bring forth a government which will make peace with the Vietcong and with Hanoi.

As the military situation continues to deteriorate, the cry will be raised for an attack on the populated centers of North Vietnam around Hanoi and Haiphong. There we would be killing women and children, something we are at present trying, it appears more or less successfully, not to do. I do not think that we shall stoop to that. And if we did stoop, it could land us in a war not only with the 16 million Vietnamese but with 700 million Chinese.

That would be a war we would not be able to win. For despite Mr. Hanson Baldwin and Senator McGEE, who have the illusion that we could dispose of the Chinese forever by meeting them once now, there is no way of fighting a preventive war with China. When we had devastated Chinese cities, there would still be many hundreds of millions of Chinese left, and they would be dedicated at taking revenge against the white devils. Mr. Baldwin and Senator McGEE should remember that the First World War, which ended in the unconditional surrender of the German army and the dissolution of the German empire nevertheless led straight to the Second World War.

If we are honest and realistic, we must prepare ourselves for the contingency that the civil war will end in a Vietnamese deal with the Vietcong, and that then we shall be asked to withdraw our troops. That would be a defeat in which we would lose considerable prestige, having unwisely engaged our prestige too lavishly. But it will still be essential to our interests to be identified with the terms of an attractive settlement in Indochina.

For whatever the course of events in South Vietnam, the United States will continue to be a great power in the South Pacific, and we shall have an important part to play in any settlement. We should have identified ourselves long ago with the terms of a settlement. We should have relied not only on the Defense Department but also on a State Department capable of conceiving a constructive settlement in southeast Asia.

While it may perhaps be too late now to affect the course of the civil war in South Vietnam, we should bear in mind that in time of war an enlightened government must prepare for peace.

Mr. MORSE. In that column he said, and I think so rightly:

The time cannot be far off when there will have to be a serious reappraisal of our policy in Indochina. Before saying any more about this, let me say at once that this does not mean that we can or should withdraw our troops, abandon our clients in Saigon, retire from the theater and give up the effort to safeguard the independence of the Indo-Chinese states. The reappraisal of our present policy is necessary, I submit, because the policy is not working and will not work. It will have to be reappraised in order to avert disaster—the disaster of our expulsion from the area leaving China supreme over it, and the disaster also of an escalation to a Chinese-American war.

In that one paragraph Mr. Lippmann summarizes a great deal of what I have had to say for more than a year in opposition to American policy in southeast Asia.

I have not advocated that we abandon operations in this area. I have advocated that we change our status from warmaking to peacekeeping. I have advocated that we change our status from unilateral military action, without a scintilla of justification under international law, to one of multilateral action, joining with other nations in keeping our obligations and theirs under existing treaties, including our treaty obligations under the United Nations.

Instead of our becoming a lawful nation under international law, we continue to be an outlaw nation. Our outlawry now is taking on the form of killing increasing numbers of people who themselves, so far as individuals are concerned, are innocent of any knowledge of the causes of their killing.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to say:

In my view, the bombing policy is not working because it is only half a policy. It is half baked. Or, to change the metaphor, it is all stick and no carrot. We are telling the North Vietnamese that they will be very badly hurt if they do not quit. And we make these bombing raids to convince them that we have bombs and know how to drop them. But we are not telling the North Vietnamese what kind of future there would be for them and the rest of Indochina if the war ended as we think it should end.

That is completely in line with my advocacy, for more than a year, that we have a great opportunity in southeast Asia to export what I have called economic freedom, an export that would be of aid to the masses of southeast Asia.

I have urged for more than a year that we make clear to the world that we stand ready to assist the peace-loving nations of the world in setting up something comparable to what Franklin Roosevelt recommended some 20 years ago; namely, an international trusteeship in this troubled spot of the world.

That would require a negotiated settlement, not on the part of the United States, the North Vietnamese, Red China, and South Vietnam, but a negotiated settlement directed by third parties nonparticipant in the war up to this time.

We seem to think that any negotiated settlement must be one that we dictate. The United States is never going to be able to dictate a settlement in southeast Asia, this year, or 10 years from now, or half a century away.

When there is a war situation such as there is there now, the settlement is going to have to be reached by the exercise of the good offices of nonparticipants. I think the best source for those negotiators is to be found in the United Nations, exercising the procedure made available to all countries members thereof under United Nations procedure.

This is now an American war. It is no longer a South Vietnamese war. The South Vietnamese are now doing what the United States tells them to do. The United States is directing the war. The United States is doing the bombing and the killing. The United States is using American planes completely manned by Americans. The United States is dropping the bombs. The United States is making use, in a variety of forms, of the 7th Fleet. The United States is conducting the war, and the United States is conducting the war completely outside of the Constitution of the United States. The United States is conducting this war without a declaration of war.

Although the administration likes to soft-pedal this weakness in its program, history is not going to soft-pedal it. History is going to show the shocking dereliction of the United States in respect to its conduct in southeast Asia.

We do not help ourselves by pointing out that the Communists are just as bad. They are. They too have been violating their international obligations. There is no question about the North Vietnamese violations or Red China's violations, and possibly that of others. The fact is that we are going to have to face up to the warnings of Walter Lippmann, because history will prove him right.

Let me read another warning or two from this great article:

As our objective has been stated in the glossy generalities of the President and in the deliberately obscure language of Secretary Rusk, we are offering Hanoi a choice between destruction and military withdrawal. Because the military terms we are demanding have not been defined, they amount in fact to another version of unconditional surrender. Nothing has been said publicly, and so far as I am aware nothing has been said privately, as to how things should be or could be arranged if Hanoi in fact did quit.

It should not surprise us moreover that the policy is not working. The measured bombing, measured to be short of precipitating a wider war, does not deter or compel Hanoi. The punishment they are suffering is tolerable and can be absorbed. On the other hand, the demand that Hanoi quit supporting the Vietcong falls on deaf ears. For the Vietcong is winning the war, and the time may be not far off when a coup in Saigon will bring forth a government which will make peace with the Vietcong and with Hanoi.

The Lippmann article should be read by the Senate and the people of the United States. I say to the Johnson administration: "Answer it. The country is entitled to a documented answer."

It will not answer it because it cannot. The premises laid down in that article are unanswerable if the attempt to answer it is made on the basis of a justification of American outlawry in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in today's Washington Daily News entitled, "This Dirty Little (Viet) War—Bombings Cloud Fact That Ground War Goes Badly."

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

THIS DIRTY LITTLE (VIET) WAR—BOMBINGS CLOUD FACT THAT GROUND WAR GOES BADLY

(By R. H. Shackford, Scripps-Howard staff writer)

SAIGON, March 18.—The aerial bombings of North Vietnam are spectacular, and for more than a month they have received great publicity and official attention.

But they tend to hide—and offer a chance for people to forget—the dismal fact that the war on the ground is going very badly for our side, as it has been for many months.

This is especially true of north central and northern sections of the country where, as in the case of Binh Dinh province, battalion-sized battles have been going on for weeks without decisive results.

MAGNITUDE

Last week's casualty figures made public today suggest the magnitude of this dirty little war. The South Vietnamese Army suffered 250 killed and the Vietcong 520. The bitter fact is that all those killed on both sides are Vietnamese. In the same period two American military deaths occurred.

Another clue as to how far from its end this war is—however many air strikes of the present type occur—is that 175,000 refugees fled from battle areas of north-central provinces where conventional warfare is going on.

Some officials foresee the possibility of a million or so such refugees eventually adding to the problems of the South Vietnamese Government.

CAUTIONING

Still other officials here are cautioning against encouraging any tendency to think the U.S. decision to bomb the north will solve this problem. They doubt that selective limited bombing will change matters at all, unless there is a vast change in offensive actions on the ground.

American bombings certainly have improved for the moment the morale of the South Vietnamese army and of the men who try to run the government. But the average Vietnamese is not very excited—arguing that it is Vietnamese who are being killed by United States and South Vietnamese planes, whether above or below the 17th parallel.

PRELUDE

Unless the bombings of the north are a prelude to a big war, which no one, including the Americans, wants, they have very limited potential in forcing the North Vietnamese Communist leader Ho Chi Minh to plead for a cease-fire. Only the most naive believe Ho Chi Minh will do that while the Vietcong position on the ground is so superior.

In the wake of excitement, publicity, propaganda, and hopes resulting from the air strikes, there is a dangerous tendency to forget what the highest U.S. officials have preached for months—that the war in Vietnam would have to be won in the south, and that any action against the north is merely supplementary.

The best summary of this policy, which still prevails despite hopefulness in the air strikes, was made by the State Department last year when it outlined the four options before President Johnson.

REJECTED

It rejected categorically the first two: withdrawal from Vietnam and "neutralization," which it considered a euphemism for communization. The third option was described as "military actions outside South Vietnam, particularly against North Vietnam to supplement the counterinsurgency program in South Vietnam."

Before such action finally was taken, in early February, the policy statement said:

"Whatever ultimate course of action may be forced upon us by the other side, it is clear that actions outside South Vietnam would be only a supplement to, not a substitute for, progress within South Vietnam's own borders."

The fourth option was to help the South Vietnamese "win the battle in their own country."

On each of his visits to Washington, Ambassador Maxwell Taylor argued that the war here would be won or lost in the south. Despite bombings of the north, that fact never has been truer.

If the American bombings of the north provoke the South Vietnamese to take agressive action against the Vietcong, then the tide might turn. But if, as some fear, America's more direct involvement leads South Vietnam to "leave it to Uncle Sam," then only disaster is ahead for both the United States and this country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the escalation of the war by the bombing of North Vietnam distracts attention from the fact that we are making little progress against the Vietcong. We are not going to make any progress against the Vietcong. We can kill a great many of them, but we are dealing with the crystallization of the determination to put the United States out of Asia. The United States will be kicked out of Asia 10, 15, 20, 50 years from now, but during that entire period of time, the struggle against the United States will continue. Sooner or later, the American people—after hundreds of thousands of coffins containing dead American soldiers are shipped back to the United States—will finally hold to an accounting any administration which seeks to continue the unnecessary killing in Asia not only of American boys but also of other human beings.

At long last, the situation will be settled, but it will be settled on the basis of terms which intelligence could settle upon now, if intelligence were to be applied to the war in South Vietnam, and if the administration were to insist that the Pentagon—which obviously is determined to head us into a massive war in Asia—be placed under a check.

Read the testimony and the public statements of men in uniform representing the United States today. Some of those leaders, testifying on the House side, have become the most desperate men in the world. It will be said that they are retired. Nevertheless, they represent the war psychology of the Pentagon, and have for years, in the testimony as to the need for a preventive war against China.

There can be no successful preventive war against China. A preventive war against China would mean a massive war. It would mean throwing the world into a holocaust.

Moving 300,000 American troops into southeast Asia if Red China makes a move is being discussed. Those 300,000 troops would soon be increased to 3 million, and we cannot produce a single military expert who will deny it, if we get into a war with China.

The military consultant of the New York Times spoke the other night on the television as to the need for sending over 1 million troops. That is only the beginning, but at least the military consultant of the New York Times was smoked out, at long last, for he has openly advocated what has been perfectly clear he had in mind, namely, a preventive war against China.

A preventive war against China would mean world war III.

To think that in our time there would be advocacy of war as a substitute for trying every available procedure known to mankind to try to bring about peace without war. That kind of thinking I shall never be able to understand.

Today, no one seems to wish to talk about morality. It is interesting that when we try to get a war hysteria afloat in the land—and we are well on the way toward the development of a war hysteria—if one talks about morality, he is assumed to be a little "queer."

Yet, whenever we leave the temple of morality we can be sure we must come back to it before evidence has resolved the problems facing mankind that draw the line between war and peace.

The United States is retreating from its morals. The United States is retreating from its ideals. The United States is marching in the jungle of immorality so far as its foreign policy is concerned.

No longer are the voices of those in opposition to American foreign policy in southeast Asia so alone as they were a year ago tonight. We do not speak alone any more. There is growing evidence that various forces which develop public opinion share our point of view. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by C. L. Sulzberger of the New York Times foreign affairs department, entitled "Foreign Affairs: The Masque of the Red Death," and published in the New York Times on March 17.

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

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: THE MASQUE OF THE RED DEATH

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

SAIGON.—A prime rule of modern guerrilla warfare is that partisans should initially seek to take over rural areas while leaving cities alone as islands invested by enemy garrisons. In accordance with this tradition perhaps 70 percent of South Vietnam is either directly or indirectly controlled by the Vietcong, but all its principal towns and cities remain in Government hands.

STATISTICAL PARADOX

This produces statistical paradox. Maps show immense areas under guerrilla authority; yet charts demonstrate that a heavy proportion of the population, which has large urban elements, can still be listed as loyal. We have seen this phenomenon in other partisan wars, some won and some lost. Even at the worst moments of the Greek Communist insurrection, which failed, Athens and Salonika stayed under Government control. The same was true of Kuala Lumpur in Malaya, and Manila in the Philippines. Even where guerrillas won, the British held Dublin and Cork until they decided the Irish Rebellion was too costly. France was dominant in Hanoi and Haiphong long after Dienbienphu, and all Algeria's main cities were French until Paris handed them over to the nationalists.

Cities, above all capitals, therefore assume an unreal life when isolated from the hinterland in a guerrilla conflict. They are centers of power. They are centers of leisure and amusement provided by moneymaking entrepreneurs to soldiers on leave, donning an aspect of artificial and even insidious gaiety.

And they are also centers of espionage and susurrus intrigue.

Today's visitor to Saigon, always one of the Orient's more deliciously evil capitals, therefore feels much like a participant in Edgar Allen Poe's story, "The Masque of the Red Death." You will recall this tale about frolicsome refugees from a plague who attend a grand costume ball at which, in the end, death himself appears in fancy dress as his own bubonic self.

A THRIVING BUSINESS

Saigon's merchants, restaurants, and nightclubs do a thriving business with the allies who have come to protect it. Street peddlers sell goods that evidently originated in the huge U.S. post exchange which offers everything from tape recorders to whisky. American soldiers stroll with their slender, pastel-pajamaed girls. There is a good deal of money about despite the constant drain siphoned off to Swiss banks and French real estate by Vietnamese near the apex of authority.

One does not, of course, know what all these bustling people truly think. A goodly section of officialdom has the habit of working with the foreigner. It backed the French against the Vietminh as it now backs us against the Vietcong. Administration exists more by the power that, as Mao Tse-tung put it, grows out of a gun barrel than by popularity.

GOVERNMENT WEAKNESS

Save for passing moments no Saigon Government has ever been able to command the loyalty, much less the affection of the masses. The administrative and judicial systems have generally been weak and corrupt. Today, when coup d'etat has become a municipal sport, there is a hint of disarray. Initiative is hampered by fear of reprisals after another putsch. The fitfully censored press is not illuminating.

Saigon's face smiles into the bright sunshine, but one always wonders whether, like disease behind the beauty of the bar girls, the smile does not conceal something. The Vietcong is careful to address its views here with a high degree of sublety. It doesn't speak of communism, only peace. It stresses the contrast between fat-dripping upper class wealth and mass poverty. It inquires what point there is in fighting for absentee landlords who, if defeated, will slip off to France, or for Americans who advertise that some day they will go.

DISUNITY FACTORS

There is no ingrained spirit of nationhood to galvanize confusion. Buddhist disputes Catholic; general eyes jealous general; faction strives with faction; and the huge Chinese community feels ignored and excluded. South Vietnam's essential requirement should be a competent, respected regime; in fact any regime at all. The United States, acting as friend and counselor, has no way comparable to that of communism of discerning trained cadres of supporters. Jefferson was no prophet of counterinsurgency.

So, slowly each evening, the sun slips westward toward Cambodia's famous ancient temples. Like redolent, long stemmed flowers, girls come willowing along the street without joy. Hefty, meat-fed boys from the great American plains rattle along the avenues in jeeps. And, as dusk gathers beyond the circumscribed neon fringe, there is a rustle of the Vietcong in the frog-filled jungle and a snicker of cicadas in the dark.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in support of my observation that no longer are our voices so much alone, first, an editorial published in the San Francisco Chronicle for March 9, 1965, entitled "Viet Pullout Is Favored in Poll," which discusses what is happening in regard to public opinion as illustrated by the poll taken in California; the poll itself; and a short series of letters published on the same page of the San Francisco Chronicle, under the heading, "Confusion and Concern Over Vietnam Dilemma."

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

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 9, 1965]

VIET PULLOUT IS FAVORED IN POLL

The northern California public is disenchanted, dismayed, concerned, and confused by the state of affairs in South Vietnam, according to the balloting in the Chronicle poll on the Vietnam dilemma.

Two out of three respondents say they are confused about what we are fighting for, six out of seven say they are disenchanted over the South Vietnamese Government, and the depth of their concern is made evident by the large number of comments which they enclosed with their ballots. In "Letters to the Editor" today will be found a sampling of these views.

Although the Johnson administration seems committed to a hotter war, northern Californians are opposed to intensifying action in Vietnam. Their answers to question 2, for example, show only 14 percent favoring increased action; 24 percent are for holding the line against a wider war, but the majority opinion of 54 percent actually wants to see the United States pull out of South Vietnam. Respondents do not feel that U.S. security is at stake there; 80 percent deny that our security is essentially involved. (The State Department, however, is sending form letters to its correspondents saying: "We are involved in Vietnam because * * * our involvement is essential to American security.")

In an altogether confused situation, what seems clearest is the desire of The Chronicle poll respondents to get the United States extricated somehow from Vietnam, to get the United Nations to accept responsibility for maintaining Vietnam's territorial integrity, and to seek the neutralization of the country through negotiations involving the major interested nations, including Communist China and the Soviet Union.

The percentage favoring the bringing of China and Russia into negotiations was 82, which corresponds precisely with a Gallup poll sampling of nationwide opinion.

In a dispatch to the New York Times, James Reston wrote after a journey through the South that he had found the mood in the country about Vietnam to be an odd mixture of concern and trust in the President. Reston heard no serious discussion of the Vietnam problem. To judge from the intensity of feeling displayed by most of our respondents, that is not the case here.

THE CHRONICLE POLL—RESULTS OF BALLOT NO. 45, DILEMMA IN VIETNAM

(Following are the results of ballot No. 45 of the Chronicle poll which appeared on this page February 23. The percentages indicated are based on the total number of ballots received. Where the "Yes" and "No" percentages do not add up to 100, the difference represents ballots expressing no opinion.)

1. Eleven years ago the United States began giving military aid and advice to the South Vietnamese to help them resist infiltration and takeover by the North Vietnamese.

(a) Do you think it was wise to take that step onto the mainland of Asia? Yes, 28 percent; No, 70 percent.

(b) If the United States had not gone to South Vietnam's aid in 1954, do you think communism would control the country today? Yes, 53 percent; No, 27 percent.

2. Today South Vietnam admittedly has not achieved the political and military stability which the United States set out to encourage, and the situation is deteriorating. Check which of the following courses of action you favor:

(a) Hold the line against widening the war. Yes, 24 percent; No, 16 percent.

(b) Increase action; do whatever it takes to win, even if that means widening the war. Yes, 14 percent; No, 34 percent.

(c) Pull out of South Vietnam. Yes, 54 percent; No, 16 percent.

(d) Obtain the U.N.'s acceptance of responsibility for maintaining the territorial integrity of South Vietnam. Yes, 53 percent; No, 11 percent.

3. From what you know about the principles of the South Vietnamese Government, are your sympathies with it? Yes, 12 percent; No, 76 percent.

4. Do you feel it is essential to our security that the U.S. Armed Forces hold South Vietnam? Yes, 19 percent; No, 80 percent.

5. Do you feel that the issues in the Vietnam conflict are basically the same as those in the Korean conflict? Yes, 44 percent; No, 44 percent.

6. General de Gaulle and U Thant are pressing for negotiations among the major interested nations for the neutralization of Vietnam and other parts of southeast Asia.

(a) Would you favor inviting Communist China and the Soviet Union to sit in on these negotiations? Yes, 82 percent; No, 15 percent.

7. U.S. forces in South Vietnam now number about 24,000. Many are draftees who complain they do not know why they are there or what they are supposed to be fighting for.

(a) Do you share this confusion? Yes, 61 percent; No, 34 percent.

(b) Would you favor a policy of sending only volunteers—not draftees—to military duty in Vietnam? Yes, 32 percent; No, 46 percent.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—CONFUSION AND CONCERN OVER VIETNAM DILEMMA

EDITOR: If the United States had not gone to South Vietnam's aid in 1954, it seems certain that the Vietnamese would be ruled by a government of their own choice. They have had, instead, a series of military dictators fighting for U.S. handouts.

Democracy, by definition, cannot be imposed. A correct U.S. policy in Vietnam should stem from the principle that a government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed.

ALICE E. GINN.
JIMMIE GINN.

SAN FRANCISCO.

EDITOR: We must end the disastrous Kennan-Dulles containment doctrine in favor of positive, peaceful measures of the foreign aid without military and political interference, perhaps of the Peace Corps type.

Leaves from the "Teahouse of the August Moon"—again we are finding ourselves teaching the natives democracy even if we have to kill every single one of them.

WALTER GERSTEL.

EL CERRITO.

EDITOR: A traditionalist peasant population which has suffered the dubious advantages of 60 years of French colonial rule, Japanese occupation and then a succession of reactionary autocrats and military strongmen and which has been brutally terrorized by the forces on both sides of the conflict, confined in concentration camps and shuffled about the country, is unlikely to recognize the inherent advantages of constitutional government and the free enterprise system,

in whose name these barbarities have been committed.

The really unfortunate fact is that in this instance even blowing the whistle for the Marines will not solve the problem. Short of the direct application of nuclear devices the United States would never be able to win a ground war against the Chinese on the southeast Asian peninsula.

GILBERT F. WHIPPLE.

SAN FRANCISCO.

EDITOR: Thank you for your thought-provoking questions. They helped to clarify the problem in my mind and lead me to examine my opinions and personal motives as a citizen of the United States and of the world.

CAROLYN ALLFREE.

WOODLAND.

EDITOR: I believe that the 14-nation Geneva Conference should be resumed. The Conference should agree on a coalition government (consisting of the rightwing moderates and leftists) for South Vietnam. This government would pave the way for free elections. The people would probably vote for communism, but if that is what the people want, that is their right, and no nation (including the United States) has the right to interfere in the internal affairs of another country.

WALTER BALLIN.

SAN FRANCISCO.

EDITOR: I think that it is idealistic to hope that we will win the war the way things are going. Unfortunately, we simply must fight harder in order to progress to victory. South Vietnam's war is now also our war. Our prestige, for whatever it's worth, and our security, indirectly, are involved and threatened. The United Nations is simply not strong enough to contain the war, although, I agree that it would be much safer to hand the whole thing over to them.

South Vietnam is simply another Communist stepping stone to world domination. They must be stopped somewhere. South Vietnam is just as good as any place.

M. MATTSON.

SAN FRANCISCO.

EDITOR: It seems to me that the Communist issue is greatly overdone in Vietnam as it is elsewhere. I think the issue in Vietnam is the age-old issue of the people versus the landed gentry plus the military.

Why is it that our country, founded in revolution, always takes the side of the status quo, against the revolution?

H. E. SODERSTIOM.

HEALDSBURG.

EDITOR: It seems to me senseless to carry on military operations in a country where it would seem we really are not welcome by the majority of the people. At least the people (the little people) do not seem to want our kind of freedom and democracy, as they know it by our actions—air raids on villages where nonmilitary people are killed and so on.

Before it is too late—let us get the world into a conference to settle this affair—our do-it-yourself program just isn't worth it.

GEORGE S. KOCH.

BERKELEY.

EDITOR: I am convinced that the Vietnamese people would be better off with a Communist government than they have been under the control of foreign military and Roman Catholic rule.

U.S. ambitions in Vietnam include all the evils of extraterritoriality from which China suffered until the Communists ended it. This opinion does not all imply a favorable attitude toward communism in the rest of the world—but it would probably be an improvement over the status quo in South Vietnam where, again, the Catholic politicians block all social evolution.

R. S. ADAMS.

OAKLAND.

EDITOR: The issue of the war in Vietnam is the same as the issue of the Korean war. The issue is whether the Communists should be allowed to conquer and subjugate the world by the use of force. The value of Vietnam lies not in whatever small strategic value it may have. Vietnam is a symbol to the entire world of our determination to resist the spread of communism and to allow the peoples of the world to choose their political philosophies by their economic and social merit rather than by their local military strength.

We must make it our intention to supply enough aid to the Vietnamese people to insure the speedy defeat of the Vietcong aggression * * *.

JOHN LARUE.

NEVADA CITY.

EDITOR: In particular reference to question No. 5, I feel that there is a very substantial difference between the Vietnam and the Korean conflict.

In the latter, the United States had support from other members of the United Nations and, certainly, full support and cooperation from the South Korean Government and people. None of this is true in Vietnam.

WALTER S. STRAUSS.

SAN RAFAEL.

EDITOR: If the United States became almost hysterical at the thought of Cuba, 90 miles away, being a base for weapons not marked "made in U.S.A." and demanded their removal, is it then perfectly all right to fill up Vietnam and Laos and the South China Seas with American weapons just as close as we can get to China with whom we decline even to speak?

Is it "unprovoked aggression" when a person born in Vietnam, and whose parents and grandparents were born there, sets off a bomb at an American military installation in their country, and then, is it perfectly all right and a "victory" to burn and destroy Vietnamese people, houses and villages because someone there does not hold the officially approved "made in America" opinions?

DOROTHY HEINEMANN.

CONCORD.

EDITOR: I believe the United States has problems enough here at home to solve and it is not necessary to expend billions in taxpayers' money and sacrifice the lives of our soldiers to impose our way of life on a people who clearly are not adapted to our kind of society.

China has been exploited by Japan, Russia, Great Britain, France and the United States. A new era has dawned and we must recognize that China is a dominant force in the world and any settlement of southeast Asian problems will have to have China's concurrence.

JAMES C. BROWN.

FELTON.

EDITOR: It is far past time to shape a more human definition of victory in Vietnam. The program of developing the lower Mekong Basin, in which several countries have already participated for several years, is eminently constructive, humanly beneficial, and relatively immune to political attack.

Introduction of a United Nations presence in the form of a much-needed security force for that program would give the U.N. prestige and influence in southeast Asia. As a counter to Sukarno's and Mao's unprincipled, warlike goals there, this would constitute both a substantial and genuinely moral victory for us.

PHILIP S. WHALEN.

PALO ALTO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I recommend for reading by Senators an article published in the Saturday Review on February 27, 1965, entitled "Vietnam and the American Conscience." It is now made available to the public through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM AND THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE

Vietnam is profoundly complex, but it is not so complex as to defeat the American intelligence or disable the American conscience. Some facts and implications are clear, no matter how murky the general situation.

The first fact is that the United States today does not have the backing of the Vietnamese people in whose name it went into Vietnam in the first place and whom it is seeking to save today. The United States military forces have had to cope not just with secret agents from North Vietnam but with the growing opposition of the populace as a whole. In briefings of new U.S. military personnel, the point is stressed that most Vietnamese are either sympathizers with or secret members of the Vietcong. The retaliatory bombings by the United States of North Vietnam targets do not meet the problem represented by internal opposition within South Vietnam itself.

The second fact is that most of the military equipment used against American and South Vietnam military forces has come neither from Communist China nor North Vietnam but from the United States. It is ludicrous to talk about bombing supply lines from North Vietnam as a means of shutting off the flow. According to some estimates, up to 80 percent of the military equipment used by the Vietcong originates in the United States. In largest part, it is either captured by the Vietcong or turned over by supposedly loyal South Vietnamese. No one knows how much of the equipment finds its way to Communist China. A Chinese official interviewed in Peiping several months ago said he was almost reluctant to see the Americans leave; they had contributed so heavily to the Chinese arsenal.

The third fact is that the legal justification invoked by the United States for its involvement in Vietnam has long since been nullified. Under the terms of the 1954 Geneva Agreement, all foreign forces and military equipment were to stay out of Indochina. The United States came with military force into Indochina, most notably in Laos, South Vietnam, and Thailand, declaring it had done so at the request of the governments involved, which was not a violation of the treaty. But nothing in the treaty gave the United States the right to finance revolutionary movements or to participate in undercover subversion. (In Laos in 1960 and 1961, the United States financed and equipped the effort of General Phoumi Nosavan to overthrow the only elected government in the history of Laos. At the same time, the United States continued to pay the salaries of loyalist forces and to furnish their supplies. Thus the United States was in the astonishing position of underwriting both sides of a civil war. Eventually, the situation was restored to its prerevolutionary status, but only after many thousands of civilians were killed or became homeless.)

In South Vietnam, the inability of the Diem government to maintain the support of its own people constituted a severe drag on the war effort. Eventually, the Diem gov-

ernment was overthrown and the Premier assassinated. Later, Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., former Ambassador to South Vietnam, said the United States had been directly involved in the antigovernment plot. Whether Premier Diem was or was not authoritarian and backward is beside the point; the American people have never given their Government a warrant to engage in subversion or murder. Since Diem, regimes in South Vietnam have come and gone; which of them has enjoyed genuine legitimacy it is difficult to say. In any case, what is the legal basis for our presence now? Our presence was requested by a government no longer in existence, and one that our own ex-Ambassador said we helped to overthrow.

The fourth fact is that our policy in Vietnam in particular and Asia in general has not been of a piece. Basically, an important objective of our foreign policy is to keep the Soviet Union and Communist China from coming together in a unified and massive ideological and military coalition. But our policy in Vietnam is producing exactly the effect we seek to avoid. Nothing that has happened since the original rupture between the two major Communist powers has done more to bring the Soviet Union and Communist China together again than recent American actions in Vietnam. The Communist Chinese have long argued that the Russian idea of coexistence was an anti-Marxist and antihistorical notion that could only be advanced by naive sentimentalists. They claim war is inevitable because of the nature of capitalism. As evidence, they assert that the United States, despite its claim that it sought only to promote the internal stability of Indochina, was actually pursuing a war against Asian peoples as an extension of the very imperialism Asians had fought so hard to expel. The Soviet Union, which is no less concerned than the United States about Chinese expansion throughout Asia, also has to be concerned about its standing in the world Communist community. It cannot allow itself to appear indifferent to military action involving a member of that community. Any expansion of the war by the United States into North Vietnam would force the Soviet Union to identify itself with North Vietnam and thus with China. In any event, in pursuit of one goal the United States appears to be losing a larger one. If the Communist Chinese had deliberately set a trap for the United States, they could not have more effectively achieved the result they sought.

The fifth fact is that American newsmen have had a more difficult time in getting unmanipulated news out of Vietnam than out of almost any crisis center in recent years. James Reston, associate editor of the New York Times, testifying before a congressional investigating committee in 1963, said the news in Vietnam was being managed in a way inconsistent with the tradition of this society. In the past 2 years there has been some improvement in news policy on Vietnam but the American public has yet to be fully informed about the nature of the American involvement, the degree to which U.S. arms have been sustaining the attackers, the extent of the popular opposition, and the inability of the South Vietnam Government to mount an effective response against the guerrillas.

The sixth fact is that President Johnson has genuinely tried to keep the military lid on in Vietnam, recognizing the ease with which the hostilities could mushroom into a general war; but he has been under extravagant pressure, much of it political, to translate American military power into a dramatic solution. The national frustration about Vietnam has far exceeded the national comprehension of the problem, for much of which the Government has only itself to blame. In any event, there has been comparatively little counterpressure in support of a policy of restraint and an eventual nonmilitary settlement—a failing that the American people have it within their means to change whenever they wish to do so.

The United States is concerned and properly so, that the loss of South Vietnam would lead to grave consequences—territorial, political, psychological—throughout Asia and indeed most of the world. Already, the fact of developing atomic power in China has made a deep impression on many nations whose histories have pitted them against Western outsiders. American policymakers fear that U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam or even a reluctance to press the war would weaken or destroy the image of the United States as a resolute, dependable, and successful foe of aggressive communism in the world. These are not illogical or nonhistorical fears, but it is equally logical and historical to raise questions about the damaged image of the United States that is emerging from the present actions in Vietnam. There has been an outpouring of anti-American sentiment not just in Asia but throughout the world—and it would be a mistake to charge it all to Communist manipulation or propaganda. Even among our friends in France, Great Britain, and West Germany there has been a sense of shock and outrage. If we thought we were building prestige by taking to the air and dropping bombs in Vietnam, we have built strangely indeed.

It is tragic that most of the debate over Vietnam has vibrated between total war and total withdrawal. It is made to appear that the only choice is between absolute victory and absolute defeat. There is an alternative—if our main objective is to promote the stability and security of the area. And that alternative is to involve the United Nations, with all its limitations, to the fullest possible extent. Any general war growing out of the combustibles in Vietnam would bring catastrophe to most of the world's peoples. On the principle of no extermination without representation, they have a right to ask that they be consulted now, while there may yet be time.

The situation in Vietnam is far more complicated than it was in Korea, but no one can say that no good can come out of a U.N. effort similar to one existing in Korea. Korea has had numerous truce violations and difficulties, but because of the U.N. Korea at least is not aflame today. Secretary General U Thant has provided an opening for such an effort by calling not just for restraint but for "shifting the quest for a solution away from the field of battle to the conference table." To the extent that the United Nations could be brought into this quest, the chances for a constructive outcome will be increased.

There are no easy answers to Vietnam. But some answers may be less volatile and more morally imaginative than others. Moreover, at some time soon the United States will have to recognize that a military policy without a full ideological and social program will not only fall short of its goal but may actually boomerang. In any case, the prospect for finding a workable answer to Vietnam will increase, not decrease, in direct proportion to the unblocking of an American conscience and the activation of an informed debate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, please note the subject, "Vietnam and the American Conscience."

Whether it be at a dinner party, in the cloakrooms of the Senate, on a train, on an airplane, at a club, or wherever one may happen to be when the subject of American foreign policy in South Vietnam is raised, the discussion invariably gets around to the question of conscience.

There is a growing guilt complex sweeping through American public opinion. There is growing recognition that there is serious question as to whether we can justify in our own consciences the course of action that we are following in jeopardizing the peace of the world by conducting an American war in southeast Asia.

It is interesting, but most people know that, after all, the holy of holies, the inner sanctum, is our individual conscience. Most people recognize that when we sit in that temple we never sit alone. We cannot sit in that temple and consider these principles of right and wrong and make much of a case for our country conducting a war, without its first having exhausted all procedures available to it under existing international treaties to try to prevent the escalation and the continuation of that war.

I believe that this article in the Saturday Review is an article that Senators in particular could profit from reading.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Vehicle for Withdrawal." The State Department, the Pentagon, and the White House could well afford to give some consideration to the premises laid down in this excellent article.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 24, 1965]

VEHICLE FOR WITHDRAWAL

It is doubtful that Europe could have been reclaimed from the Nazis if the people had had any sympathy for Hitler or were uninterested in his removal. It looks increasingly doubtful that we can maintain a position, much less win a war, in South Vietnam against the opposition or apathy of the "ally." If so, the question is, What then?

The situation is different from World War II on other scores as well. We are fighting alone, some 7,000 miles from our shores, on part of the rim of a huge land mass dominated by Communist China; it is wretched terrain and we are confronted with an extremely difficult kind of guerrilla operation.

Still, we probably could hold if the Vietnamese people and governments were solidly behind us and determined to rid their land of Communist infiltration, and there would be much to be said for trying to do so from the standpoint of our national interest in thwarting Communist aggression around the world. It is the possibility that we can't hold because of circumstances beyond our control that makes it necessary to inspect the current clamor for negotiations to end the fighting and supposedly neutralize the area.

It seems to us that such negotiations are not something to be for or against but simply one of the prospects that has to be faced. Certainly the general history of failure of that kind of conference is long and uninspiring.

In particular, the Geneva Conference of 1954 solemnly guaranteed, among other things, the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of South Vietnam. So today the nation is swarming with Communist Vietcong guerrillas bent on conquest, a gang which the superior forces of South Vietnam and the United States have been unable to rout.

Much good that conference and that agreement did. Now, 11 years later, the Vietcong are winning, aided by what would otherwise be the farcical politics in Saigon and the inability of the United States to devise or carry out effective strategy or tactics; the reprisal raids against the North show scant sign of stopping the guerrillas in the South.

In other words, any reconvening of the Geneva Conference would appear to mean the Communists were "negotiating" from strength. It could all too easily be just a prelude to a Communist takeover of South Vietnam.

Many Americans react in horror at the thought. It smacks of betrayal, defeatism, giving in to the Communists; it is asked how we could ever expect any other people to believe we would defend them if we gave up South Vietnam. It is for these reasons that we don't see how anyone can be enthusiastically "for" negotiations.

Those who insist on standing firm no matter what, however, have to weigh the alternatives to negotiations, none of which looks especially bright.

The United States could, for one alternative, try to keep muddling along with the present halfway war, but it seems likely a built-in time limit is set for that approach; that conditions may finally be created in which the United States will be asked to leave or forced to by its own recognition of the futility of staying.

The United States could, instead, widen the war in various possible ways. Thus, if we cannot beat the Vietcong in the South, we could bomb North Vietnam into an industrial rubble. No one can say positively what the Soviet and/or Red Chinese reaction would be, but the chance of their intervention cannot be ignored. Is Vietnam, given the prevailing attitudes there, worth it?

Here we think it should be understood that in the long, global conflict with communism, we cannot realistically expect to win every victory and never give up any ground at all. Military strategy itself dictates withdrawal to firmer positions when a particular position becomes untenable; if we do not look at the struggle with communism that way, we will constantly be getting into untenable positions at exorbitant cost. Not every withdrawal is comparable, in inherent importance or as a matter of U.S. national interest, to Munich.

That consideration should be kept in mind, we think, when it is argued that withdrawal from Vietnam would lose us the confidence of others menaced by communism. As it happens, no one, including allies committed to the defense of the area, is exactly rallying round our fight. The real point, though, is that when we elect to make a stand in southeast Asia or anywhere else, we should be reasonably sure it is terrain we can defend and, most of all, that we have the support of the people we are defending.

In this case it looks more as though the South Vietnamese are deserting us, wittingly or otherwise, than the other way around. It is their successive "governments" and their troops and their civilians who for the most part have shown the lack of interest or will in saving themselves, even with fantastic U.S. aid and mounting U.S. casualties, from the Communists.

Like most Americans, we want a sensible and honorable solution in Vietnam, and it is even conceivable it could work out that way, by means not presently clear. But to be unalterably "against" negotiations is to omit the unpalatable possibility that we may not be able to continue the fight in that particular place.

At least let us be clear what is under discussion. The talk of negotiation and "neutralization" cannot be seriously regarded as a solution guaranteeing the safety of South Vietnam. If the United States is nonetheless forced to negotiation, we may as well recognize it as mainly a vehicle for withdrawal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Escalation Policies May Bring United States Less," written by Roy Bennett and published in the ADA World of March 1965.

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

[From the ADA World, March 1965]

ESCALATION POLICIES MAY BRING UNITED STATES LESS

(By Roy Bennett)

In any international crisis the first casualties are morality and legality. Power and its uses—which some call diplomacy—move on to center stage. This is where we are today in southeast Asia.

It therefore would be less than useful to continue the discussion on whether the bombings at Pleiku were part of contingency planning set months ago, or were the spontaneous, outraged, moral responses of military and civilian leaders who found our will being tested by Hanoi. At crisis point the more relevant questions are: do we have the capacity to carry out the commitments we seem inexorably to be making? Do we know the consequences of our act? Are we willing to pay the enormous price of a possible elementary miscalculation?

There appear to be three main groups with views on these crisis questions. The first is the preventive war (against mainland China) group. The second is the strong, intelligent and influential group which contends that our aim is negotiated settlement, but that the use of force necessarily must be used to achieve it—and it must be an American settlement. The third seeks a negotiated settlement of the entire area by aggressive multilateral diplomatic and political initiatives. The position on this group has been set out better than can be stated here by Senators FULBRIGHT, CHURCH, and MANSFIELD, by Walter Lippmann, Kenneth Galbraith, and Hans Morganthau, Jr., to name just a few.

The first view is sheer madness; the second, intelligent illusion; and the third, pragmatic reality. Hopefully what follows will support these contentions.

With respect to the first group, it is common knowledge they hold the view that if the United States does not now employ our overwhelming airpower against mainland China's nuclear and industrial centers, in 5 years at the most, she will possess a credible deterrent and the present felicitous opportunity may never exist again.

There is no doubt that we have the capacity to reduce to rubble not only Lap Nor and the nuclear diffusion plants, but every major Chinese city, within days or even hours, with no fear of retaliation. The only flaw in this otherwise perfect political and military gem is: what does one do after having reduced North Vietnam's and China's cities to ashes? Even on the kindergarten assumption that the Soviet Union could sit idly by watching this holocaust, what happens then?

It matters little whether the escalation moves north slowly or is a rapid surgical operation. The issue remains—does the planning of the preemptive strike group include U.S. engagement of the remaining 5 or 6 hundred million Chinese and 200 million southeast Asians in a land war following the successful bombings? It was never easy to give a rational answer to an irrational query. It is no easier now.

A further question arises. Do we not, by this policy, also make a prophet of Mao Tsetung and a fool of Kosygin and his colleagues? Is it conceivable that this could become current U.S. policy?

The second group—those who believe force must be the midwife of any settlement—would appear the most influential, literate and persuasive. It is this group which is most closely associated with the original South Vietnam commitment. It actually began in the early stages of the Kennedy administration. Until 1961, according to Government reports to the press, less than 1,000 men were involved. The growth of our commitment since has been geometrical. In the past 12 months alone there were three developmental stages: the bombing in Laos in early summer; the Gulf of Tonkin retaliatory raids on North Vietnam in July; and the current bombings in Laos and North and South Vietnam. The lines at times seem to blur between the first and second groups. And they ought not to, for the issue is far too dangerous, and one trusts there is a real difference.

In the verbal arsenal of the second group there is a strong argument which is too often avoided or answered on purely moral and legal grounds. That is—if we assume the premise that China's policies correspond to her words, how can we make a viable settlement if the desire for it does not exist? How, if a settlement is made, can it be implemented?

In essence these questions raise Chinese duplicity and the consequent domino theory. This theory holds that the loss of any one nation means the automatic toppling of all the nations of Southeast Asia, Africa, and possibly Latin America—one nation at a time.

To answer this theory, one must reverse it. The present hard-nosed policy of refusing for 14 years to consider anything less than victory, has proved that these nations will be lost one by one, as the domino theory predicts. In other words, it is not settlement which will prove the domino theory correct, it is the absence of settlement that is doing so. If we refuse to negotiate; if we have as our declared aim the substitution of the Taiwan for the mainland regime; if we insist China has no right to friendly and secure borders, which we and all other great powers demand for ourselves, China will be expansionist. And the nations on her borders will be the dominos we are so afraid they will become.

There is, then, only one solution to the inherent problem of expansionism. It is an alliance of southeast Asian states, viable, independent, economically secure, and with international guarantees of their independence by the great powers—those 6,000 miles away and those 6 miles away. * * *

* * * * *

America is falling into a Vietcong trap. America should not permit the Vietcong to determine American foreign policy by small guerrilla attacks. The Vietcong attacks on American bases in South Vietnam are provoking this Nation into military actions which, if continued, will result in a major escalation that will force first Communist China and then Russia into the war. Indeed, American bombings can accomplish the unification of Russia and Communist China's policies with detrimental effects upon this Nation's interests and long-range goals.

America should not allow itself to be provoked into improvident actions. The civil war in Vietnam cannot be won by the bombing of North Vietnam or even Communist China. Its only result can be the Vietcong's purpose—namely escalation.

There is only one sensible course for America. The bombings of North Vietnam should cease immediately, and then this Nation should announce its willingness to seek a peaceful settlement that will result in a neutral Vietnam, guaranteed by the major powers, with a U.N. presence.

ADA urges the following program of positive steps:

1. Worldwide call for a cease-fire.
2. An announced willingness to negotiate.

3. An immediate call by the United States for an emergency meeting of the U.N. Security Council to seek a multilateral end to this threat to the peace. The Security Council should then be authorized to call in all interested parties—including those not members of the U.N.

Time is running out. ADA urges America to move rapidly in our own best interests before it is too late.

National Director Leon Shull said there was little time left to bring pressure to bear on the administration before a new hard policy line sets in that may foreclose negotiations before they start.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have had something to say before, from time to time, about the great journalistic statesmanship of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Consistently, courageously, and in very penetrating fashion, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has written editorial after editorial in opposition to the U.S. policy of conducting an undeclared war in southeast Asia.

On March 7, 1965, it published an editorial under the heading "Weak Reed to Lean On." I read an excerpt from this excellent editorial:

There is nothing very new or very mysterious about North Vietnam's support of the Vietcong Communists in South Vietnam. There is nothing very new or strange about the flow of arms, ammunition, and men from the Communist north to the south.

These facts of conflict have long been familiar to the world, just as are the additional facts that South Vietnam's Government is the creature and dependent of the United States, that its armed forces are equipped and trained by the United States in the same way that Vietcong key personnel are equipped and trained by North Vietnam.

Why then should the State Department publish, with so much fanfare, a white paper to prove the already well-established fact that the Vietcong insurrection against the Saigon government is supported by the Communist regime in Hanoi?

The answer, of course, is that by this means the United States hopes to justify its air strikes against the north and any further measures it may take to expand the war. The object is to convict North Vietnam of aggression, to argue that the hostilities are not just a local civil war, in which the Hanoi Communists have intervened on one side and the United States on the other, but a clear-cut case of "flagrant aggression" against "a sovereign people in a neighoring state."

If this point can be proved, the State Department evidently hopes to convince the world that any military measures we take in Vietnam are warranted as aiding a free people's defense, while any such steps taken by Hanoi are morally reprehensible acts of conquest.

On the propaganda level, the white paper may mislead people who are willing to be misled, but it does not stand up against critical examination, and its value as a defense brief must therefore be questioned. Those facts about Vietnam which it so carefully omits greatly weaken its case.

For example, the white paper quotes excerpts from a 1962 report by the International Control Commission, finding that men and arms had been flowing from north to south in violation of the 1954 Geneva accords. It does not mention that the same report found that the 1954 accords had also been violated by "our" side.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Mar. 1–7, 1965]

WEAK REED TO LEAN ON

There is nothing very new or very mysterious about North Vietnam's support of the Vietcong Communists in South Vietnam. There is nothing very new or strange about the flow of arms, ammunition and men from the Communist North to the South.

These facts of conflict have long been familiar to the world, just as are the additional facts that South Vietnam's Government is the creature and dependent of the United States, that its Armed Forces are equipped and trained by the United States in the same way that Vietcong key personnel are equipped and trained by North Vietnam.

Why then should the State Department publish, with so much fanfare, a "white paper" to prove the already well established fact that the Vietcong insurrection against the Saigon government is supported by the Communist regime in Hanoi?

The answer, of course, is that by this means the United States hopes to justify its air strikes against the North and any further measures it may take to expand the war. The object is to convict North Vietnam of "aggression," to argue that the hostilities are not just a local civil war, in which the Hanoi Communists have intervened on one side and the United States on the other, but a clear-cut case of "flagrant aggression" against "a sovereign people in a neighboring state."

If this point can be proved, the State Department evidently hopes to convince the world that any military measures we take in Vietnam are warranted as aiding a free people's defense, while any such steps taken by Hanoi are morally reprehensible acts of conquest.

On the propaganda level, the white paper may mislead people who are willing to be misled, but it does not stand up against critical examination, and its value as a defense brief must therefore be questioned. Those facts about Vietnam which it so carefully omits greatly weaken its case.

For example, the white paper quotes excerpts from a 1962 report by the International Control Commission, finding that men and arms had been flowing from North to South in violation of the 1954 Geneva accords. It does not mention that the same report found that the 1954 accords had also been violated by "our" side.

Nowhere does the white paper mention that the 1954 accords, far from establishing a sovereign state of South Vietnam which is now the victim of external aggression, merely set up two temporary zones, separated by a line explicitly defined as "provisional and not in any way to be interpreted as a political or territorial boundary." Nowhere is it mentioned that the accords called for "free general elections by secret ballot," by which the people of North and South were to decide their own future. Nowhere is it mentioned that the elections were never held because the United States had meanwhile moved in and set up a client government committed against reconciliation with the North.

In any international court, including the court of world opinion, those facts not mentioned by the white paper will be weighed alongside those that are; and they are damaging indeed to the claim that Hanoi's military aid is flagrant aggression, while ours is a high-minded defense of freedom. If the white paper is intended to provide advance justification for expanded war in Asia, the Johnson administration is leaning on a weak reed, and would be wise to direct its policy, instead, to obtaining a political settlement by negotiation and diplomacy.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it ought to make every American sad when he learns that the Government of the United States, the Pentagon, the State Department, and the White House, have concealed from the American people, so far as their reports are concerned, the ugly fact that the Neutral Control Commission has found against the United States, as well as against North Vietnam, Red China, and South Vietnam.

That is what causes many of us to warn the American people that they have already walked a long way down the road toward government by concealment.

The administration does not like to have those of us who criticize it on its South Vietnam policy point out that the administration at no time has given the American people all the facts that they are entitled to receive about the United States action in South Vietnam. The American people have a right to those facts. The American people have a right to be officially notified by the administration itself of findings against us as well as findings for us.

Of course, if the public were told all the facts, the administration might not be able to make the progress it thinks it is making in spreading war propaganda across this Nation.

Sooner or later the facts will catch up with this administration. When that happens, so far as its war in southeast Asia is concerned, the administration will be repudiated by the American people. I am trying to save this administration that unhappy hour.

Mr. President, we cannot justify the United States' acting unilaterally in the world today, setting itself up as a self-appointed policeman in Asia, setting itself up with the unjustifiable assumption of power because of its military strength, and saying to the world, as our U.N. Ambassador told the Security Council some months ago:

The United States intends to do whatever it thinks is necessary in southeast Asia, and the rest of the world can like it or else.

Much of the rest of the world does not like it, and much of the rest of the world is going to follow the "or else" route. That is not going to be in the interest of the United States.

I now ask unanimous consent that there may be made a part of this speech another editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 15, 1965, entitled "Nothing Succeeds Like Failure."

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

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Mar. 12, 1965]

NOTHING SUCCEEDS LIKE FAILURE

Until the Pentagon started campaigning for an expanded war in Vietnam, American military experts estimated that aid from North Vietnam accounted for 5 to 10 percent of the Communist military effort in South Vietnam. Recently the Pentagon increased the estimate to 15 to 20 percent.

Not too much confidence can be placed in such figures, but common sense and experience both confirm the view that the major

part of the Vietcong insurrection is indigenous and independent of outside aid. Even the State Department's white paper, designed to maximize North Vietnam's role, indirectly acknowledged that at least two-thirds of the Vietcong forces are locally recruited in the South.

If these are the facts, it is not surprising that President Johnson's stepped-up air strikes against the North would have a limited effect. That is one reason why the policy was so questionable from the beginning. Now, according to Washington dispatches, the administration is poring over intelligence reports which show that the bombing campaign not only has failed to change the military situation in the south but also has failed to produce any visible effects on infiltration activities from the north. The training camps, the staging areas, and the supply lines to the south all seem to be operating as usual.

In ordinary life results like these would be taken as an indication that perhaps other tactics should be tried in place of those that have failed. But the curious logic of cold war bears little relation to humble reality, and so President Johnson is reported to be drawing the conclusion that the stepped-up air strikes must be stepped up yet more. The administration may be putting out this report in a bumbling effort to wage psychological war—whether against the Communists or against the American people is not clear—but it is a credible report all the same. Once it is assumed that applying military force will bring a desired result, the degree of force deemed acceptable is subject to being steadily increased, step by step. Once the Nation looks down this road, it looks all the way to nuclear bombing and total war.

To risk escalation on such a scale would be serious enough if it were done on behalf of some acutely vital national interest, but when the most that could be achieved is a 10 or 15 percent reduction of the Vietcong war effort, the gamble becomes ludicrously irrational. Lyndon Johnson may be proving his fortitude by this policy, but we fancy most Americans would prefer that he prove good judgment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, ugly realistic situations such as those outlined in the editorial are what we the people must face up to, and then answer the question whether we are going to let our President continue to make war in southeast Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article published in today's Washington News calling attention to the killing of 20 schoolchildren in South Vietnam by the dropping of a bomb.

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

SOUTH VIET PLANES KILL 20 PUPILS

DA NANG, VIETNAM, March 18.—South Vietnamese fighter-bombers killed from 20 to 30 children Tuesday in an attack on a school and village only 7 miles south of here, it was disclosed today.

A Vietnamese Army spokesman said the pupils were crushed or suffocated when the ceiling of a cave where they had taken shelter from the planes caved in.

The spokesman blamed their deaths on the schoolmaster, whom he described as a Vietcong officer. He said the schoolmaster was using the same building as a Vietcong military post and as a school.

A spokesman said a Vietnamese observation plane was fired upon as it flew over the village of Man Quang to make a landing at Da Nang.

The plane returned, spotted a Vietcong flag on the school flagpole, and was fired at by 12 armed men in the schoolyard. An immediate strike was therefore ordered.

Mr. MORSE. There is an interesting alibi for this killing. The South Vietnamese, the story shows, as Senators will see when they read it, report that the killing occurred because Vietcong leaders had hidden the children in a cave, and the bombers spied a Vietcong flag. The children were killed.

There will be increasing numbers of such killings of innocent children, innocent women, and innocent men. The course of action that the United States is following in North Vietnam will result in increasing the killing of innocent civilians.

With every such incident, no matter what kind of whitewash is used to try to justify the killing, the hatred of Asians for Americans will intensify.

We are on our way to becoming the most unpopular people in the world among an overwhelming majority of the population of the world. I suggest that we start thinking about American boys and girls 100, 200, and 500 years from tonight. We have that responsibility of statesmanship. We have the duty to be thinking of foreign policy in terms of the kind of heritage we leave to future generations of American boys and girls. If we continue to follow the Johnson foreign policy in southeast Asia, we shall leave a heritage of hatred for Americans for generations to come—all over Asia.

So I say to my President, "Get to a conference table." I say to my President, "Get this war stopped by bringing in third parties that have a vested right to exercise some voice in determining whether or not the United States, Red China, and North Vietnam are to be allowed to lead the world into a third world war."

But members of the administration do not like to hear me say it. They resent my saying it.

Mr. President, we cannot follow cause-to-effect reasoning; we cannot take a body of evidence that we already have involving the escalation of the war in southeast Asia by the United States; we cannot listen to the testimony of the spokesmen for the Pentagon and the State Department; we cannot listen to their evasion of specific commitments as to what their objectives are, and escape the conclusion that the top military advisers of the President of the United States are bent on carrying the war to Red China. That is why we get a trial balloon from the lips of a retired naval admiral before the House committee, warning that we shall have to whip China.

It is my fear that in the background of the strategy of the war hawks representing our Government today in the Pentagon, they have their eyes on the nuclear installation in Red China, and they are bent on bombing it if given a pretext that they can use, not as a reason, but as an excuse.

I should like to make two additional statements. Do not forget that when we knock out that nuclear installation it can be rebuilt. It may require 10 or 15 years. But that is merely a second of time so far as oriental philosophy is concerned, for time has no value to them.

I say to those in the Pentagon, "You destroy that nuclear installation and it will be rebuilt in the course of time. But it will be rebuilt by a people determined to wreak their vengeance on the American people as the Government that destroyed that installation in the year 1965. When they produce their missiles and nuclear bombs, we will know what we left as a heritage to future generations of American boys and girls, for those bombs will be dropped on us."

But we are told, "That is speculative. That is theoretical." It is stark reality for those who are willing to face reality.

I close by expressing my prayerful hope that my country will not delay longer keeping faith with its once professed ideals, with its once proclaimed doctrine that it believes that all disputes that threaten the peace of the world should be resolved by a resort to the peaceful procedures available under a rule of law—and that spells out what has become apparently to this administration an ugly word—negotiation.

Rather than have an ugly war, I would have emblazoned in the skies of the world the word "negotiation" as mankind's last hope for averting World War III. If we do not seek to resolve the growing war in Asia, we shall be headed for a massive war, not only there but throughout the world.

An honorable negotiation under existing international procedures offers mankind its last best hope for avoiding a holocaust in Asia.

NOMINATION OF HENRY H. FOWLER TO BE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am happy to announce to the Senate that the President this afternoon sent to the Senate Finance Committee the nomination of Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to succeed Douglas Dillon as Secretary of the Treasury. I believe that most Senators know Mr. Fowler and have an extremely high regard for him because of the duties and responsibilities carried by him in various agencies and departments of the Government, the most recent being that of Under Secretary of the Treasury, under Mr. Dillon.

It is my understanding, after having a conference with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], that hearings on Mr. Fowler's nomination will be held by the Committee on Finance tomorrow. It is my hope that those hearings will be expeditious and thorough, so that this nomination by the President can be reported to the Senate as soon as possible.

It is my further understanding that several members of the Committee on Finance, including the assistant majority leader, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], as well as the chairman of the committee and other Senators, have been consulted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I consider myself fortunate to have been in the Chamber when the majority leader made this announcement. I should like to indicate my delight and keen pleasure that the President has seen fit to nominate so able a citizen, so erudite and delightful an individual as my old friend Henry Fowler to be Secretary of the Treasury. The President could not possibly have made a better choice.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it was with great delight that the junior Senator from Louisiana learned that the nomination of Henry Fowler to be Secretary of the Treasury will be before the Committee on Finance for consideration. The Senator from Louisiana had an opportunity to work with Henry Fowler while he was Under Secretary of the Treasury. I believe I share the view of every member of the Committee on Finance who worked with Mr. Fowler for a long period of time on the Revenue Act of 1964, as well as on other revenue acts, when I say that he exemplifies the highest type of American public servant.

For some time it was known that Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon had felt that the burden of his office, as well as other public service that he has rendered, were such that eventually he would have to step down for the good of his own health and his personal affairs, enjoy a well-deserved rest, and devote his activities to his private personal and business affairs.

In my judgment, the President could not have chosen a better man to succeed Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon than Henry Fowler. Henry Fowler was the moving force behind the Revenue Act of 1964, of which I had the privilege to be in charge on the floor of the Senate. He spent many long hours and days assisting me to understand all the intricacies and problems involved in the preparation of that legislation. Without his help that measure, the largest tax cut, indeed the largest revenue bill in history, would have foundered in a sea of conflicting theories, philosophies, and ideas.

Henry Fowler is a Democrat. In my judgment, he is a Democrat in every sense of the word. He believes in Democratic philosophy and Democratic traditions. At the same time, he is a man who understands business. He has worked for business as a lawyer, and he has the respect and confidence of the business community. Since the President is a Democrat, he should have named, as he did, as successor to an outstanding progressive Republican, a man of the caliber of Henry Fowler to be Secretary of the Treasury. I do not believe he could have named a better Democrat, or for that matter, a better man of any party, than Henry Fowler, with whom it will be my pleasure, as a member of the Committee on Finance, to work. I am delighted with this appointment. I hope the Senate will act expeditiously to confirm it.

I wish also to extend my congratulations to his devoted wife and helpmate Trudye who is so well known, admired, and appreciated by those of us who have spent some time in Washington. The job will impose great new burdens on the two of them, but they are the types who have never complained of the vigors of public service, in fact the type who seek to serve where they can serve best.

(At this point, Mr. MORSE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. CLARK Mr. President, on the night of January 4, millions of persons heard President Johnson unfold his vision of the Great Society. I am confident that most Americans shared my feeling that evening that the President had, as he so eloquently said, collected his vision "from the scattered hopes of the American past."

The Great Society is a long way from coming into being; but, in my judgment, we in the 1st session of the 89th Congress can make a substantial contribution to bringing the Great Society into effect within our lifetime.

This afternoon, I should like to discuss my personal views as to matters which should have the highest priorities in our efforts to give the impact of our own congressional judgment to the program of the President, as set forth not only in his state of the Union message, but also in his budget message, his economic message, his manpower report, and and in the literally scores of other recommendations he has sent to Congress for legislative action on our part.

To my way of thinking, by far the most important and the most vital issue concerning our country today is peace. How are we to obtain peace? How are we to keep it? How are we to assure a just and lasting peace for ourselves, our children, and our grandchildren? To my way of thinking, perhaps the first priority in that regard is to find an honorable way to bring the war in Vietnam to an end. I support the President in the position he has taken in that regard, because I believe that, under the Constitution, the President of the United States is vested with the authority to conduct our foreign policy on a day-by-day basis. He is taking a calculated risk, as we are all aware. But there can be no doubt, to my way of thinking, that the day is past when military solutions will solve critical and difficult questions of foreign policy.

I reiterate that I support the President. Yet, I would hope that within the State Department, and within the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the midnight oil is burning in an effort to find practical, feasible and honorable ways of bringing the present conflict in Vietnam to an end.

On a longer range basis, I would hope to see the United States of America urge the Russians to go back to Geneva, to reconvene the 18-Member Disarmament Conference in order that renewed efforts could be taken under American initiative to move forward on the roads toward peace: Eventual disarmament, the dismantling of the nuclear delivering weapons, and a long stride forward toward that goal so eloquently stated by President John Fitzgerald Kennedy in the brilliant speeches he made on the subject in 1961 at the United Nations, in 1962 at American University, and in 1963, again before the United Nations, shortly before his tragic death.

The program of President Kennedy was to establish general and complete disarmament under enforceable world law. He urged the Russians to join us in a peace race, not a war race. It is time for us to get back to the vision of President Kennedy and become again, as we were in those days, the leaders of the world in terms of seeking a just, lasting, and honorable peace.

We should never become a laggard in that effort. I should hope that in all the agencies within the executive arm of the Government, and within the Congress, we could find encouragement for the President to pick up again the torch of peace which was carried forward so brilliantly by his predecessor.

What do I mean with respect to meaningful agreements in terms of peace? I mean continuous and persistent negotiations to bring about a feasible, comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. I mean continuous negotiations in an effort to move forward with a treaty to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. I mean a completed agreement on arms control and disarmament to bring to an end the deadlock in enforcement and inspection questions which has hamstrung progress on these vital matters since President Kennedy committed us to this cause.

We should be in the vanguard of the efforts to break that logjam, that deadlock. We should make proposals which are entirely within the range of safety for our country, and yet which will make it possible for us to move forward significantly.

There will shortly be coming before the Senate two treaties which deal with the revision in certain minor respects of the Charter of the United Nations. One of those treaties would expand the membership of the Security Council. The other treaty would expand membership on the Social and Economic Council.

When those treaties come before the Committee on Foreign Relations, they will be joined by a concurrent resolution which I shall shortly introduce—which will be an updated concurrent resolution which had as its number in the last Congress, Concurrent Resolution 64. I shall have at least as many—and possibly more than the 19 cosponsors I had the last time. It will call for the preparation by the executive arm of our Government of a comprehensive plan for determining how we can best move forward in the area of disarmament, should we drastically revise the United Nations Charter, try hopefully to get rid of the veto, to get rid of the very difficult problem in the General Assembly of one vote, one nation, and provide a workable method of financing the organization.

We should provide some feasible method of financing the expenditures of the United Nations which will not depend on the concurrence of nations which all too often are unwilling to pay their assessments.

Or, in the alternative, should we move into the area occupied by the treaty

tabled at Geneva in 1962? That outline treaty called for the creation by the major military powers of the world largely the 18 nations which are members of the Disarmament Conference plus Communist China. That number included France, although it has never taken its seat. In due course, obviously Communist China will have to be included. We should move to create an International Disarmament Organization composed of major military powers with a new institutional setup to deal with and create an organization which can supervise the carrying out of a treaty of arms control and disarmament without the veto; with an international peace force at its command, and with a vast expansion of the whole concept of international law, a new jurisprudence to create a strengthening of the international court's jurisdiction, the creation of new institutions of equity of mediation, of conciliation to which could be brought for solution political questions, with sanctions established to enforce through the international organization the decrees and judgments of such a court and other judicial and quasi judicial institutions.

When this proposed concurrent resolution reaches the Committee on Foreign Relations, together with the two treaties, which would, in fact, make minor revisions in the United Nations Charter, I hope we shall have a great debate on the functions of the United Nations and proceed to consider how to create those types of international institutions of limited jurisdiction which are so essential in maintaining any meaningful, just, and lasting peace. I shall have a good deal more to say about this subject of peace as the session continues.

My second priority would be to give great encouragement to effective population control, both domestically and overseas.

In his state of the Union message, the President promised to "seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population."

We now have what to me is a most significant memorandum issued by AID, in which it is set forth as a principle of U.S. foreign policy that we shall encourage requests by underdeveloped countries find means to bring their population growth under control. As a result, one could hope that no longer would we be looking at the difficult situation in which the gross national product of these countries increases through the efforts of these people, abetted by the aid that we give them in various categories, while the rate of their population increase absorbs on a per capita basis all of their growth. They end by being no better off than when they started.

I would suggest that on the domestic scene we could find that as the war on poverty continues, as requests are made to implement and continue that program, we shall be able to encourage Sargent Shriver and those who work with him to encourage communities—as Corpus Christi, Tex., recently did—to make application for a grant under the poverty program to enable them to set up birth control clinics among their poor, among their people on relief, and among those unfortunate women who continue to have unwanted children year after year because they do not know how to prevent it. We would thus make as large and successful contribution to the poverty program as we could in any other way.

My third priority—and I state these priorities not in their order of importance but merely to put them on the record—is the question of full employment. Only one aspect of our prospering economy is a cause for serious concern: Continued high, persistent, chronic unemployment, much of it regional, much of it cyclical, some of it frictional, but continuing in a time of economic prosperity, a level of unemployment which would not be permitted to continue for one moment in any one of the advanced countries in Western Europe. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I am vitally interested in programs to assure full employment. It is my clear belief that the budget submitted by the President is inadequate for this purpose; that we ought to have a massive program of public works to assure full employment. We know what to do to bring about full employment with reasonable price stability but we have not taken the necessary steps to carry out what we know how to do. We ought to have a program of accelerated public works to put people back to work while at the same time creating wealth through projects raising the level of accomplishment in a dozen different areas in the public sector of our economy.

The fourth area which is of the highest and greatest need is aid to public school systems for construction and teachers' salaries. In this the occupant of the chair [Mr. MORSE] has taken leadership in the Senate. I have been happy to follow his leadership, and to assist him, if I could, in bringing to the floor necessary legislation to solve the critical problem of education. The President's education bill as sent to the Congress, calling for $1,500 million, is a good start. As the Senator from Oregon well knows, this is only a start. The program will be and must be continued for years; and the amount contributed by the Federal Government will have to be increased. The greatest asset we have is the brains of the boys and girls of this country. They need to be better educated from kindergarten to postgraduate school.

There is also a great need for many more trained teachers in the schools to lift our education from the mediocrity into which it has fallen today.

The Senator from Oregon knows that the tax resources of the States for raising the level of education are inadequate to deal with the problem, and that the Federal Government must continue a massive infusion of funds, know-how, and brains without, however, bringing education under Federal control.

We must have an educational program to equip school dropouts and unemployed older workers with skills that are not likely to become rapidly obsolete in our increasingly automated industrial system.

We must bring further aid to higher education to assure that college and university plants have the modern equipment and skilled teachers they need, so that every young person may have the opportunity to be educated to the limit of his or her abilities. Advanced education for millions of workers is necessary if we are to meet our manpower needs and keep our economy growing; but a shockingly large proportion of high school students, many of them among the brightest and most talented, do not go to college because of financial difficulties.

Finally, we must have a massive program to measure the number of teachers and to encourage America's teachers to upgrade their skills.

My fifth priority is a rather wide-ranging one. I call it a Beautiful and Healthy America but it has major importance for urban communities. The President has brought new dedication to the cause of rebuilding our cities, conserving our natural resources, cleaning up air and water pollution, and eliminating blight in the cities and suburbs. There should be established a Department of Urban Affairs, of which I have been a long-time advocate, to help achieve these objectives. There should be more effective housing and urban renewal legislation. We need more land for open space. We need recreational facilities for city dwellers as well as for those who live in the country. In building our society in this respect we can at the same time help solve our unemployment problem.

The sixth, and a high priority indeed, is to establish promptly by legislation the right of every American citizen, regardless of race, color, or creed, to cast his vote. In that respect we took a long step forward today. It was a fine day in the history of this country when today we assured for the first time in 100 years that a civil rights bill would reach the floor of the Senate after appropriate consideration in committee, a procedure which the Senator from Oregon has fought for so valiantly, so we can follow orderly procedure and the committee can report a voting rights bill and have a bill enacted, hopefully, without either long, and unduly extended debate or by the imposition of the cloture rule.

The seventh priority, upon which all the others may depend—not now, perhaps not next year, but possibly as early as 1967, after the election of 1966—is comprehensive congressional reforms to assure, first, speaking externally, that we do something to upgrade the caliber of Senators and Members of the House, to do it by purifying the election process by establishing conflict-of-interest procedures, by giving Members of the House of Representatives 4-year terms, by cutting down the errand boy duties of Members of Congress—also, internally, and within the Congress to bring about comprehensive revision of the rules, practices, procedures, and floor action of both Houses, to assure that in the Congress of the United States, as in every other

legislative body in the civilized world, a majority will be able to act when a majority is ready to act, and that the program of the President will have an opportunity to be voted upon, after receiving appropriate consideration by committee—not necessarily a favorable vote; sometimes, necessarily, there will be unfavorable votes. But the prerogative of the President is to have his program voted on up or down or with amendments by the Congress.

These are the seven major priorities which I suggest we should set for ourselves in the days ahead. I hope these suggestions will meet with the approval of a majority of my colleagues across the aisle as well as on the Democratic side, for these are the principles of the National Democratic Party. These programs are based on the political principles advocated by the last four Democratic Presidents, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and Lyndon Baines Johnson.

These are the programs with respect to which the Congress has too frequently lagged behind; programs which, if they are enacted into law and come into effect, can bring about, in the lifetime of the younger Members, if not some of us who are older, that Great Society of which the President has spoken so eloquently.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Monday, March 22, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 18, 1965:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for terms expiring March 31, 1971:

R. Watkins Greene, of Louisiana, vice J. Pittman Stone.

Ralph K. Cooper, of Arizona, vice Glen R. Harris.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dr. Norbert Wiener—1894–1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RODNEY M. LOVE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, today, March 18, 1965, marks the first anniversary of the death of Dr. Norbert Wiener, a great American mathematician and teacher, whose brilliant and creative achievements earned for him the respect and admiration of his contemporaries. Much of his work has had a direct impact upon the national defense and upon the science and technology of this Nation. Shortly before his death the President conferred on him the National Medal of Science for his work in biology, mathematics and engineering. I think it is most appropriate to recall, on the first anniversary of his death, the notable contributions he made in these fields which earned for him the outstanding recognition he received.

Dr. Wiener was born in Columbia, Mo., in 1894. He completed the cycle of formal education from college freshman to Ph. D. when he was 18 years of age. He was a member of the faculty of the department of mathematics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology for 42 years.

He won international renown as an original and creative mathematician and exerted great influence on developments in pure and applied mathematics as well as in engineering. One of his earliest contributions was the development of a mathematical theory of Brownian motion, a contribution which put the subject on a firm foundation and developed the notion of randomness. Soon after, he developed the theory of generalized harmonic analysis which has had decisive influence in the fields of communications and control.

Many of Dr. Wiener's discoveries in pure mathematics have had application to diverse subjects such as the scattering of electromagnetic waves, atomic fission, radiative equilibrium of the stars, and prediction theory. It was as a consequence of his theory of prediction that he developed the comprehensive notion of cybernetics.

On January 14, 1964, in ceremonies at the White House, President Johnson presented the National Medal of Science to Dr. Wiener. The Presidential citation reads "For marvelously versatile contributions, profoundly original, ranging within pure and applied mathematics, and penetrating boldly into the engineering and biological sciences."

Last week Dr. Wiener was further honored at the 16th annual National Book Award ceremonies for his book "God and Golem, Incorporated" for science, philosophy, and religion. Mrs. Wiener accepted the posthumous prize for her late husband.

It is a distinct honor for me to remind my colleagues of this man's great contribution to society. His genius will long be remembered.

Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training observed ORT day in honor of the work conducted by the organization for Jews all over the world. In Massachusetts ORT day was celebrated at the New England Life Hall in Boston under the sponsorship of the Eastern Massachusetts Region of Women's American ORT.

For the past 85 years, the organization has conducted vocational programs. At present there are 600 ORT vocational training installations in 22 countries offering practical and technological training.

In addition to providing the traditional skills, ORT has recognized the growing need for training in specialized technical fields and even in the growing field of space technology.

One of the most important tributes to the work of ORT is the continual growth of its membership. There are about 100,000 U.S. members, of whom some 60,000 are in the Women's American ORT.

I congratulate this group on their good work and wish them every success in the years to come.

Restricted News in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks I have been disturbed over reports which have been filtering through from newsmen who are covering the war in Vietnam, over alleged restrictions on news coverage in that area. Evidently there have been some instances where the press has been barred, and while I do not question the necessity for certain security requirements, I am concerned about the possibility that the American public might not be getting a true and clear picture of what is happening in southeast Asia.

I have today written to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, and am