achievement of full employment and the maintenance of a high level of economic growth. Rapid economic improvement over the past 4 years has substantially reduced unemployment but there are still millions of men and women who cannot find jobs or who can find only part-time work. While praising our achievements we must not lose sight of the bitter problems that confront these unemployed workers and their families. This is a waste which we cannot tolerate either on humanitarian or economic grounds.

While we have sustained a remarkably long period of economic expansion extending to 4 years now, only a person with a very short memory can deceive himself that we have ruled out the possibility of recession. Much of our recent economic growth represents taking up the slack of the preceding years when the economy fluctuated between recessions and inadequate recoveries. Already many economists and business analysts are expressing concern over the trend of the economy later this year. In a growing nation it is not enough to maintain a level of production, even a high one. We must continue to expand to provide jobs for our growing labor force. This problem is compounded by the much-discussed postwar baby boom. Looking back 18 years we see a jump in the birth rate from 2.7 to 3.7 million. This means that over the next year or so the number of new jobseekers entering the labor force will increase sharply and be greater than we have experienced in decades.

President Johnson has cited unemployment of young, inexperienced workers as one of the greatest domestic problems facing us today. We cannot take it for granted that the economy will automatically produce the millions of jobs needed to provide for this influx of young workers and at the same time take care of those who will lose their present jobs through automation and shifts in demand and at the same time reduce unemployment to an acceptable minimum within a reasonable time.

The time to make our economic plans to assure that jobs will be available is now, and an important part of that planning should be a program to extend needed Federal assistance to overcome our multibillion-dollar backlog of community facilities and meet the requirements for future growth. To accomplish this I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2170, which would authorize 50-percent grants for nearly the whole range of local public works in towns and cities of all sizes, with the further provision that in depressed areas these grants could go up to 75 percent. The bill would authorize a continuing program of $2 billion a year for these grants.

This bill would meet several pressing problems. It would make a meaningful increase in the volume of construction of needed community facilities, thereby reducing the backlog which we must face up to sooner or later. It would help to make our cities better places in which to live and work. It would ease the financial crisis facing local government and help them to meet the whole range of their responsibilities. By opening up new land it would reduce the inflationary pressure on lot prices directly, reducing housing costs and making land available at costs consistent with lower priced housing. It would channel some of our tremendous national wealth to the neglected field of public investment and help redress the present imbalance between the private and public sectors. And finally, it will make an important and continuing contribution to sound and adequate growth of output, employment, and incomes.

This bill has already received the endorsement of the AFL–CIO and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which has always played a leading role in community development. The need for Federal grants for this purpose is recognized by both of the mayors' organizations and has their support. And the principle of grants for community facilities has the support of the National Association of Home Builders who recognize the limitation on their markets imposed by the shortage of land ready for development and the present high level of land costs.

This bill is among my highest legislative priorities and I plan to hold hearings on it later this spring. I believe the need for such a program is urgent and I am hopeful that we will be able to enact it into law.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1965

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

Rabbi Chaim U. Lipschitz, director, Mesivta Talmudical Seminary, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

With great love Thou lovest us, O Lord, our God, and with Thy great compassion Thou hast abundance of pity on us. O our Father, our King, for the sake of our fathers who trusted in Thee, to whom Thou didst teach the statutes of life, so shalt Thou favor and teach us. O Father, who art a merciful Father, have compassion on us we beseech Thee, and grant our hearts understanding, that we may comprehend, hear, learn, teach, observe, perform, and establish all the learning of Thy law, with love; and enlighten our eyes in Thy law, and our hearts to love and fear Thy name, that we may not be abashed forevermore; for in Thy holy, great, and tremendous name we trust. We shall be glad, and rejoice in Thy salvation, when Thou bringest us with peace from the four corners of the earth and conductest us with uprightness, for Thou art the Almighty who workest salvation. Our God, and God of our Fathers, be Thou with the mouths of the deputies of this worthy Senate of the United States who stand in Thy presence. Teach them what they will say, instruct them what they will speak, answer their requests, and cause them to know how to glorify Thee. May they walk in the light of Thy countenance; may they bend their knees unto Thee, and with their mouths bless Thy people. O bless them altogether with the blessings of Thy mouth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 22, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 22, 1965,

The Secretary of the Senate, on March 24, 1965, received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1496) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 86–380, the Speaker had appointed Mr. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; and Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey, as members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on the part of the House.

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

H.R. 5688. An act relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 5721. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6453. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 1496) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc, lead, and copper from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5688. An act relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5721. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1939, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H.R. 6453. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RECEPTION FOR ASTRONAUTS TO BE HELD TOMORROW AFTERNOON IN HOUSE CAUCUS ROOM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Speaker of the House and Representative MILLER, chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, have asked me to announce to the Senate that there will be a joint reception for the astronauts to be held in the House caucus room at 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. This reception will be open only to Members of the Senate and their immediate families. It will not be open to staff members, because there are 435 Members of the House in addition to Senators. I desired to make the announcement today so that Members of the Senate and their families may be able to attend the reception.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business to act upon a nomination to be reported by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and seventy postmaster nominations.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to report that the Senate Finance Committee has approved the nomination of a distinguished fellow Virginian, Henry H. Fowler, to be Secretary of the Treasury. There was no dissent as the committee voted 16 to 0 in favor of this appointment.

Members of the Senate will recall that Mr. Fowler served with distinction as Under Secretary of the Treasury from 1961 until he resigned in April of last year to resume his practice of law.

Mr. Fowler, who is a native of Roanoke, Va., began public service in 1939 as an attorney with the Tennessee Valley Authority. His broad background also includes service here on the Hill as counsel for the old Subcommittee on Education and Labor, work with several of the regulatory and independent agencies and with the Foreign Economic Administration.

In addition, he has served as Administrator of the National Production Authority, as Administrator of the Defense Production Administration, and as Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. He has also been a member of the National Security Council.

Because of this long and brilliant career of public service, Mr. Fowler brings to his new post an understanding of the workings of government, both legislatively and administratively, as well as domestically and internationally, which few men possess. These traits should serve him well as our Nation's top fiscal officer.

My long and warm personal relationship with him convinces me that Mr. Fowler will perform his new tasks with the same dedication with which he approached and accomplished his earlier public assignments. I am certain he will add luster to the great office for which he has been nominated.

The President has made a fine choice. I commend Henry H. Fowler to the Senate and I urge that his nomination be confirmed.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a brief biographical sketch of Mr. Fowler's background.

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

HENRY H. FOWLER—DESIGNATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Born: Roanoke, Va., September 5, 1908.

Home: Alexandria, Va.

Education: Jefferson High School, Roanoke, Va.; Roanoke College, 1925–29; Yale University Law School, 1929–33.

Marital status: Married.

Experience: 1933–34: Private law practice; Covington, Burling & Rublee, Washington, D.C.; 1934–39: Attorney, Tennessee Valley Authority; 1939: Assistant General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority; 1939–40: Chief Counsel, Senate Subcommittee on Education and Labor; 1941: Special Counsel, Federal Power Commission; 1941–44: Assistant General Counsel, Office of Production Management and War Production Board; 1944: Economic Adviser, U.S. Mission for Economic Affairs, London; 1945: Special Assistant to Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration; 1946–51: Private law practice as senior member of Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington; 1951: Deputy Administrator, National Production Authority; 1952: Administrator, National Production Authority; 1952–53: Administrator, Defense Production Administration; 1952–53: Director, Office of Defense Mobilization; 1952–53: Member of National Security Council: 1953–February 1961: Private law practice with Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington; February 1961–April 1964: Under Secretary of the Treasury; April 1964—: Present position of senior partner in law firm of Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington.

Awards: Distinguished Alumni Award of Tau Kappa Alpha (1958); Distinguished Alumni Award of Roanoke College (1958); Alexander Hamilton Award (1964).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As one of the minority members of the Senate Committee on Finance, I wish to join in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia in regard to the nominee for Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler. We on our side of the aisle were unanimous in approving the nomination, and we shall deeply appreciate Mr. Fowler's services.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I concur in the tributes that have been paid to the newly appointed Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Henry H. Fowler. I know that Mr. Fowler, an outstanding and patriotic citizen, will ably serve our country as Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to add to the encomiums being directed to the new Secretary of the Treasury. It was my privilege and pleasure to serve with Mr. Fowler in handling a number of revenue bills during the previous Congress. I know of no man in Government who has higher ideals and higher standards than has Mr. Henry H. Fowler. It is my judgment that he is a great credit to the State of Virginia, from which he hails, and to the legal profession. He has served ably in Government. As one of those who has worked with him, I

repeat what I stated previously in the RECORD when Mr. Fowler was nominated. I am extremely proud to support his nomination.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a member of the Senate Committee on Finance, I should like to say that Mr. Fowler looks like a Secretary of the Treasury, he acts like one, he talks like one, and he conducts himself like one. I am more than proud to concur in the observations of my distinguished friend from Virginia and to add my salute to those that have already been tendered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I concur fully with all the remarks that have been made in relation to the appointment of Mr. Fowler by the President and the confirmation of that nomination by the Senate. I do not believe that a finer choice could have been made. The Treasury Department and the United States are extremely fortunate to have a man of Mr. Fowler's caliber at the helm.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DODD. One of the really outstanding features of President Johnson's administration has been the great care with which appointive positions in the executive branch are filled.

To date President Johnson has adhered to a refreshing and sensible policy of bringing into the higher echelons men who have proven themselves able and dedicated in lower level positions.

The latest and perhaps the best example of this is the nomination of Henry H. Fowler to be Secretary of the Treasury.

It was only after careful consideration and after many possibilities had been screened that Henry Fowler was selected for this sensitive Cabinet office.

But now that he has been recommended to us, I and many of my colleagues, as well as the great majority of the experts in the fields of fiscal and monetary policy, feel that all along Henry Fowler was the logical choice, indeed the only one.

Henry Fowler and I were classmates at Yale Law School and we have maintained our friendship since that time, for over 30 years which is more years than either of us cares to remember.

He has lived up fully to the promise he showed as a young law student.

However, I am not speaking in support of Henry Fowler because he is an old friend. I am making this statement because I know he is one of the most able, most experienced, and most dedicated public servants in Washington.

He is best known to the public for the excellent work he did during the 4 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, in helping to guide through the two most important tax reduction measures in our history.

The 1962 depreciation changes and the 1964 general tax reduction that are on the statute books have accounted to a great extent for the high level of economic prosperity we enjoy today.

Few men have had Henry Fowler's opportunity to see such concrete results stem from their efforts so quickly, and this is a fitting tribute to his skill and hard work.

I have no hesitation in stating that in my opinion Henry Fowler will be one of the great Secretaries of the Treasury.

It will not be an easy task for anyone to succeed Douglas Dillon, who has done an excellent job as Secretary, but Henry Fowler is the man who can do it.

I urge prompt and unanimous approval of his nomination.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

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

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

Mr. SMATHERS subsequently said: Mr. President, I believe that in nominating Henry H. Fowler as Secretary of the Treasury, President Johnson has selected the finest and ablest man to be found anywhere for this type and character of job.

I have known Joe Fowler for many years. He is a man of the highest integrity. His knowledge of domestic and international problems is extraordinarily wide and diversified.

Further, I am proud to claim Joe Fowler—a native of Roanoke, Va.—as a fellow southerner, but one who is first, last, and always the servant of the Nation and the servant of the entire people.

President Johnson has said, "He is one of the ablest and most dedicated men I know." President Johnson's judgment in this respect is shared by virtually all of us who have been privileged to work with and to know Joe Fowler.

He has already given long and honorable service to his country. President Johnson is the fourth President under whom he has served.

Joe Fowler can truly be called a self-made man. Time and time again he has set aside his own personal interests in order to answer the call of duty and serve his Government. The son of a locomotive engineer, he holds a doctor of jurisprudence degree from the law school of Yale University.

After a brief stint in private practice, he joined the legal staff of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Later, he served admirably as counsel for the Education and Labor Committee. In 1941, he was appointed Special Counsel to the Federal Power Commission. During World War II, he served in a number of mobilization and foreign policy posts. In each assignment his reputation grew as a man who could get things done.

After the war, Joe Fowler returned to private law practice—but not for long. In 1951 his Nation beckoned him again. During the Korean war he held top mobilization posts. In 1952 he was appointed Administrator of the Defense Production Authority. Later in the same year he became Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. With the end of hostilities in Korea, or, I should say, at the cessation of hostilities in Korea, Joe Fowler once again returned to his first love, the private practice of law. However, in 1961, President Kennedy tapped him to be Douglas Dillon's right-hand man in handling the awesome crises of economic recession and balance of payments.

Working hand in hand, Dillon and Fowler began the drive to balance our international payments and played a vital role in formulating new economic policies. The measure of their success is the longest and strongest peacetime economic expansion this Nation has ever experienced.

The cornerstone of the success of our economic policy was the Revenue Act of 1964, the biggest income tax cut in our history. No one played a more important part in the passage of that bill than Joe Fowler. As Dillon's chief of staff, he ran the administration side of the bill with unerring judgment and flawless precision. But that was not all. He used his soft-spoken charm, his keen mind, and his tremendous powers of persuasion to do all in his power to speed this bill through Congress.

During that time, Joe Fowler was working 18 or 20 hours a day, 7 days a week. I know that to be a fact, because on many occasions, as many as 7 days a week, we would confer with him with respect to this particular bill.

It is the measure of this man's character that in all the thousands of personal contacts he made with members of both Houses and both parties during that time, I never heard his name mentioned except in the warmest and most complimentary terms.

He has a finely developed sense of where the responsibilities of the executive branch leave off and the prerogatives of Congress begin.

Almost every single one of us knows Joe Fowler, and many of us know him well. I doubt that the President could have found a man who enjoys as great respect from both business and labor, Republicans and Democrats, and from every section of the country, as does Joe Fowler. He will further President Johnson's goal of national unity as few men can.

When Joe Fowler resigned as Under Secretary a year ago, he let it be known at that time that because of obligations to his family he was returning to private practice for financial reasons, and because of his long desire to conclude his work in the Federal Government. He had no intention of returning to Government service. But when President Johnson told Joe Fowler his Nation needed him again, like a good soldier he set aside his personal wishes and his

private interests, and returned to harness.

When I talked with him on the tele- [redacted], shortly after he had been notified of his appointment by the President, he told me he believed that the President of the United States was not only Commander in Chief of the Nation's defense, but also Commander in Chief of the Nation's welfare, and whenever the Commander in Chief called on him, he felt he had a responsibility to respond. That is what he has done.

That is public service of the highest order. The investment banker Sidney Weinberg called him a great patriot. I concur, and I am sure that President Johnson—who has known him for 30 years—also concurs.

I believe that he will once again serve his Nation and the American people with high distinction and great honor, and will live up to the highest and noblest traditions of public service in the future as he has in the past.

I am indeed happy to join those Senators who have lauded Mr. Fowler today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF PARAGRAPH (a) OF ACT OF MARCH 4, 1913, AS AMENDED BY ACT OF JANUARY 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502)

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT, STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statistical supplement, stockpile report, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN ABACA FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 47 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting drafts of proposed legislation, as follows:

A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes;

A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission, after investigation and hearing, to require the establishment of through routes and joint rates between motor common carriers of property, and between such carriers and common carriers by rail, express, and water, and for other purposes;

A bill to amend section 204(a)(3) of the Interstate Commerce Act respecting motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers of property; and

A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the protection of certain officers or employees of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF HIGHWAY COST ALLOCATION STUDY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplementary report of the highway cost allocation study (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on the waste of funds in construction of the Shahabad Depot in Iran under the military assistance program by the Department of Defense (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary compensation to Washington, D.C., area banks for cashing Government checks, Treasury Department, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from an inflexible policy of donating flour instead of wheat to voluntary relief agencies for distribution abroad under the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, Department of Agriculture, Agency for International Development, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary interest costs incurred by the Government because of excess progress payments to contractors, Post Office Department, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary transportation expenditures for privately owned vehicles transshipped between U.S. ports, Department of Defense, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on loss in revenues to the Government resulting from undercharges for rents and utilities to employees occupying Government-owned quarters, Department of the Interior, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional costs resulting from unnecessary procurement of a diesel engine for the military 5-ton truck, Department of the Army, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary dollar costs incurred in financing purchases of commodities produced in Brazil, Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the noncompetitive procurement of traveling wave electron tubes, Department of the Navy, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS ON REFUND OF EXCESS OIL ROYALTIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the refund of excess oil royalties paid by the Continental Oil Co., during the period from March 1956 through June 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the refund of excess oil royalties paid by the Union Producing Co., during the period from April 1960 through April 1964 (with accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TAKEN TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contractual actions taken to facilitate the national defense, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Institute, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF LADIES OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

A letter from the District of Columbia representative, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Silver Spring, Md., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the year 1964 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

A letter from the president, and national director, Boys' Clubs of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial statement of that organization, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF 18 U.S.C. 1114, RELATING TO ASSAULTS AND HOMICIDES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend 18 U.S.C. 1114, relating to assaults and homicides, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 35, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO FALSE INFORMATION

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 35 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the imparting or conveying of false information (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE OF LIMITATION ON EMERGENCY RELIEF FOR THE REPAIR OR RECONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, for the year ended March 1, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITION TO VACATE CONFIRMATION CIRCUIT JUDGESHIP IN FORMA PAUPERIS

A letter from the deputy clerk, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., enclosing, for the information of the Senate, a petition to vacate confirmation of circuit judgeship in forma pauperis, by one Maurice N. Whittington (with an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"H.R. 128–212

"Resolution requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and for other purposes

"Be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to article X of the amendments to the U.S. Constitution by adding thereto the following:

" 'Among the rights reserved to the States shall be the right to sole and exclusive jurisdiction of public school systems in the separate States, and all rights, privileges and immunities of citizens of the separate States, as they relate to public school education, shall be determined solely by State courts. This Constitution shall not be construed in a manner to empower the President of the United States, the Congress or the Federal Judiciary to disparage or nullify this inherent right in the States.'

"Be it further resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the clerk of the house of representatives to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to all presiding officers of the legislatures of the several States, to the Governors of the several States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"In senate, read and adopted March 4, 1965.

"GEORGE D. STEWART,
"Secretary.

"In house, read and adopted February 16, 1965.

"GLENN W. ELLARD,
"Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

"Resolution requesting Congress to approve the Alaska Farmland Development Act

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

"Whereas Congressman RALPH J. RIVERS of Alaska has introduced in the 89th Congress H.R. 1136 which seeks to provide a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska; and

"Whereas the policy and purpose of H.R. 1136 is set forth in the proposal as follows:

" 'SEC. 2. DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE.—In order to provide more adequately for the sound, efficient, and orderly development and utilization of agricultural land resources of the State of Alaska; to facilitate and assure the establishment of family-type farms as economic units of production and to encourage, promote, and strengthen this form of farm enterprise; to provide for Alaska's future economic growth by promoting a sound and stable agriculture, thereby insuring a more adequate and dependable food supply for the present and future population of the State; and in recognition of the strategic position of the State of Alaska in relation to national security and defense, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, and the purpose of this act shall be, to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska which will assist agricultural producers to develop and utilize more effectively the productive capacity of the State's land resources for agricultural purposes': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Alaska respectfully and earnestly requests Congress to enact H.R. 1136 this year; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be directed to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture; the Honorable Orville S. Freeman, Secretary, Department of Agriculture; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"MIKE GRAVEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"———— ————,
"President of the Senate.
"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 23

"Resolution relating to the creation of a National Oceanographic Council

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

"Whereas the economy of Alaska is in great measure dependent upon the natural resources of the ocean; and

"Whereas seafood is an important food source for Alaskans; and

"Whereas Alaska commerce is vitally dependent upon maritime transportation; and

"Whereas the importance of the oceans to the welfare of all citizens of the United States, as well as of Alaskans, was emphasized by the introduction, by Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington, of S. 944 which provides for the coordination of all Federal activities regarding oceanography by a proposed National Oceanographic Council; and

"Whereas expanded and efficiently coordinated national programs as envisoned by S. 944 would be of particular benefit to the people of Alaska: Be it

"Resolved, That the enactment of S. 944 by the Congress is respectfully urged by the Fourth State Legislature of Alaska; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN C. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee; the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman, House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress."

———

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 40

"Resolution urging Congress to approve pending legislation to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956

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

"Whereas a bill, S. 998, now pending in Congress would amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 so as to extend until 1975 the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to make loans for financing and refinancing the operations of commercial fishing vessels and the maintenance, repair, and replacement of these vessels and their gear; and

"Whereas the loan program available under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 will expire on June 30, 1965, unless S. 998 is enacted; and

"Whereas U.S. fishermen are in constant competition with foreign fishermen at fishing grounds where American vessels traditionally and, until recently, almost exclusively operated; and

"Whereas U.S. fishermen now have to compete with foreign fishermen for the U.S. market; and

"Whereas private financing on reasonable terms is not available to many fishermen because of the hazardous nature of the industry; and

"Whereas the U.S. fishing fleets are antiquated and unable to compete successfully

with the more modernized foreign fishing fleets; and

"Whereas the fisheries loan program is essential for modernizing and upgrading U.S. fishing vessels in order that they may stay in operation and compete successfully against foreign fisherman: Be it

"Resolved, That Congress is respectfully urged to pass, and the President of the United States is respectfully urged to approve S. 998; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States and the President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee; the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman, House Appropriations Committee; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"———— ————,
"President of the Senate.
"MIKE GRAVEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 4

"Resolution petitioning Congress to propose an amendment to the Federal Constitution to preserve the bicameral aspect of State legislature

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

"Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court has held that both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population; and

"Whereas this holding now makes it impossible to apportion representation to reflect the diverse and conflicting interests within a State; and

"Whereas the decision of the Court will enable heavily populated areas to dominate State legislatures and will lead to a virtual loss of representation in all other areas of the State; and

"Whereas in order to prevent this complete disruption of the legislative process in the States, and to preserve for each State the right to balance its representation in the manner best suited to its individual situation, it is essential that the Constitution of the United States be amended to enable the State to apportion at least one house of its legislature on factors other than population: Be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Alaska respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment in accordance with article V of the Constitution of the United States, adding to the Constitution an article allowing any State having a bicameral legislature to apportion the membership to one house of its legislature on factors other than population; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress; and the presiding officers of each house of the legislatures of the several States.

"———— ————,
"President of the Senate.
"MIKE GRAVEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 27

"Resolution relating to the need to dredge the Kobuk River

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

"Whereas the Kennecott Copper Corp. is developing a large operation on the Kobuk River; and

"Whereas this mining operation will be of great benefit to the economy of the area and to Alaska; and

"Whereas it is imperative that this Nation's supplies of mineral resources, now and in the future, be augmented by the large deposits located in remote parts of Alaska such as the Kobuk area; and

"Whereas the river is at present only intermittently navigable during a short open season; and

"Whereas an adequate channel can be developed from the mouth of the river at the Melbourn Channel to a point 500 yards beyond the mouth of the Ambler River by dredging a relatively few river bars: Be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Alaska urges that the Corps of Engineers be directed to dredge the channel at the earliest opportunity; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce; the Honorable Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of the Army; Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army; Col. Clare D. Farley, district engineer, U.S. Corps of Engineers; the Chairman of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress Advisory Committee; the Honorable PAT MCNAMARA, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee; the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the House Public Works Committee; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"———— ————,
"President of the Senate.
"Passed by the house March 11, 1965.
"MIKE GRAVEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 37

"Resolution relating to the construction of a breakwater at Kodiak

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

"Whereas the fishing industry at Kodiak and vicinity has grown in the past decade from a seasonal to an around-the-year multimillion-dollar operation; and

"Whereas hundreds of vessels from various ports on the west coast of the United States participate in this abundant fishing; and

"Whereas the growth projections for the fishing industry at Kodiak indicate accelerated growth and expansion during the next decade and thereafter; and

"Whereas the studies made for the present boat harbor at Kodiak did not and could not have anticipated such phenomenal growth and expansion; and

"Whereas the existing boat harbor can afford protection for only a portion of the fishing fleet operating in the Kodiak area; and during the severe storms that are common to this area, many vessels are unable to find suitable protection and are severely damaged; and

"Whereas the extensive amount of damage to fishing vessels in the Kodiak area has greatly increased marine insurance rates and caused economic hardship to the fishing fleets and great financial loss to marine underwriters: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to provide funds to enable the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, to begin construction of a breakwater at Kodiak; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable PAT MCNAMARA, chairman, Senate Public Works Committee; the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman, House Public Works Committee; Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army; Col. Clare D. Farley, district engineer, Corps of Engineers, Alaska; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"MIKE GRAVEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"———— ————,
"President of the Senate.
"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

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

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 514

"Concurrent resolution expressing opposition of the Oklahoma State Legislature to the proposed decrease in appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service and to the proposed revolving fund

"Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that the Soil Conservation Service appropriation for assisting locally organized and locally managed soil and water conservation districts be reduced by $20 million and that soil and water conservation districts and cooperating farmers, ranchers, and other landowners 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 if adopted this proposal would seriously slow down the soil and water conservation effort on the privately owned lands of this Nation and would result in an estimated decrease of 40 to 50 percent in the annual application of conservation practices; and

"Whereas this proposal is adopted would reverse a policy of 30 years standing in which the Federal Government has provided technical assistance through the Soil Conservation Service without charge to farmers, ranchers, and other landowners to install farmwide conservation programs on their property; and

"Whereas the entire area of the State of Oklahoma is located within the boundaries of 87 soil and water conservation districts; and

"Whereas the State of Oklahoma has annually appropriated funds to local soil and water conservation districts to form a working partnership with the Soil Conservation

Service to install soil and water conservation practices on privately owned land; and

"Whereas if adopted this proposal would break faith with the State Legislature of Oklahoma who has been providing State funds for soil and water conservation with the understanding that the local-State-Federal team effort would be maintained as a team effort for the universal good of the Nation and all its people; and

"Whereas the adoption of the revolving fund proposal would treat landowners unfairly by requiring them to assume still more of the town and city responsibility for soil and water conservation when they are at present contributing more than one-half the total cost of soil and water conservation practices in Oklahoma; and

"Whereas the revolving fund proposal if adopted would severely retard water conservation and development in America at a time when such development is of necessity to all the people of this country; and

"Whereas assessments proposed by the revolving fund will fall primarily on family farms and small operators and will discourage and seriously curtail the application of soil and water conservation measures so vital to the strength and welfare of the State of Oklahoma and the Nation; and

"Whereas this proposed additional burden added to the cost of farmers and ranchers already in a depressed economical condition would greatly impair the ability of those people to participate in the conservation, development and utilization of our soil and water resources; and

"Whereas the supervisors and cooperators of the 87 soil and water conservation districts in the State of Oklahoma are of the opinion that the proposed cut in appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service for technical assistance and the proposed revolving fund are not practical nor in the best interests of the State of Oklahoma and of this country: Now, therefore be it

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

"SECTION 1. The Oklahoma State Legislature hereby records its complete opposition to the proposal of the Bureau of the Budget to reduce the appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service in the amount of $20 million, and to the proposed revolving fund whereby landowners and operators would be required to pay for up to 50 percent of the cost of the technical assistance for soil and water conservation practices.

"SEC. 2. The Oklahoma State Legislature respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States continue the long established policy of providing technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts and that sufficient funds for such assistance be provided to meet the increased demand by the landowners of the State of Oklahoma and of the Nation.

"SEC. 3. That a duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted by the speaker of the Oklahoma House of Representatives to President Lyndon B. Johnson; Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY; Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee; Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee; Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman, House Agriculture Committee; Congressman GEORGE M. MAHON, chairman, House Appropriations Committee; Kermit Gordon, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and to each member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives the 9th day of March 1965.

"J. D. MCCARTY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate the 4th day of March 1965.

"GLEN HAM,
"Acting President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 26

"To the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas during a recent emergency in sugar supplies and prices caused by the failure of foreign sugar interests to ship sugar to the United States in the quantities required by American consumers at reasonable prices, the Government of the United States appealed to American sugarbeet producers and beet sugar processors to produce additional quantities of this vital and necessary food without limits; and

"Whereas the sugarbeet farmers and beet sugar processing industry of the State of Washington and other States responded wholeheartedly to the appeal of their Government and, investing millions of dollars in expanded facilities, produced huge additional quantities of sugar; and

"Whereas such additional production was a significant and material factor in halting the rising tide of prices and therefore redounded to the benefit of American consumers; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, in its last previous session, failed to amend the Federal Sugar Act to provide the authority for marketing the additional beet sugar produced at the specific request of the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas as a direct consequence, the beet sugar industry now is forced to carry huge inventories of additional sugar which cannot be sold under the present law; and

"Whereas the carrying of such inventories is a burden both to the sugarbeet farmers who have been forced to accept a 10 percent reduction in their sugar beet acreage, and to the beet sugar processing industry of the State of Washington and other States: Now, therefore,

"We, your memorialists, the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Washington, do hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States of America and, more particularly, the Representatives of the State of Washington in the U.S. Senate and in the U.S. House of Representatives, to take the steps necessary so to amend the Federal Sugar Act that the beet sugar industry of the United States will be authorized to market the additional quantities of sugar produced at the request of the Government of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Passed the house March 11, 1965.

"ROBERT M. SCHAEFER,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate March 11, 1965.

"JOHN A. CHERBERG,
"President of the Senate."

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

"Joint resolution relative to the Auburn Dam and Folsom South Canal

"Whereas there has been submitted to the Congress of the United States legislation to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior, as part of the Central Valley project, of both the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Folsom South Canal; and

"Whereas this proposed development is known to be economically justified, and has been determined to be engineeringly feasible; and

"Whereas the multiple-purpose project of the Auburn Dam will furnish additional water which can be used in the American River watershed, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region, the San Joaquin Valley, and areas to the south, and will produce additional electric power which would be available for pumping water to areas of deficiency in California's statewide water program; and

"Whereas the devastating storms and floods occurring recently have again endangered many lives and done great damage to public and private property in the American River watershed and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region; and

"Whereas construction of the Auburn Dam would greatly reduce the danger of future loss of life and injury to persons and property caused by floods in these areas; and

"Whereas the Folsom South Canal will serve to bring urgently needed supplemental water supplies to areas in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region and the northern San Joaquin Valley area, which supplies would be made available from storage of water in Folsom Reservoir, as supplemented by the proposed Auburn Dam and Reservoir; and

"Whereas both the proposed Auburn Dam and the Folsom South Canal are part of the California water plan and would complement the State's efforts to meet the water requirements of California's rapidly expanding population: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law, at the earliest possible time, the necessary legislation to authorize the construction of the Auburn Dam and the Folsom South Canal, including authorization to include in such canal and related operating structures such additional works or capacity as the Secretary of Interior deems necessary and economically justified to provide for the future construction of the east side division of the Central Valley project, provided that the incremental cost of providing additional works or capacity in the Folsom South Canal to serve the east side division of the Central Valley project shall be assigned to deferred use for repayment from Central Valley project revenues; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

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

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas it is known that one of the most pressing problems facing all areas of the United States and in fact all areas of the world today is the securing of the maximum beneficial use of land and water resources for the further progress of our

people, of our State, and of our Nation, not only to realize the most from our present resources for the immediate problems of today, but also to meet our future needs for for the long-range future; and

"Whereas the area of southwestern Idaho known as the Mountain Home Snake River plain area contains a large body of land which is both economically and engineeringly feasible for the development of a highly productive and economically desirable potential for the further development of the people of this area and of the Nation, and which would add greatly to the overall economy and assist in stabilizing the existing economy of this State and of the Nation, and would present many opportunities to stimulate the economic growth of the State and of the Nation; and

"Whereas adjacent to this fine body of potential irrigated land there are adequate supplies of water in the Snake River which are now running off and unused in the State of Idaho to the detriment of the State and Nation's economy; and

"Whereas upstream developments have been demonstrated to be in the long-range interest for providing the best and most comprehensive plan of development for the utilization of the water and land potential of our river basins; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with local interests, has made engineering, water resource, and land classification studies, which studies have given conclusive evidence of the economic and engineering feasibility of a development of this area under a plan known as the Guffey plan of development; and

"Whereas the orderly continued investigation and ultimate construction and development of a water resource program for the irrigation of this potentially productive area of the State of Idaho will inure to the benefit of the State and of the Nation at large: 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 the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early authorization to the construction of the Mountain Home division, Snake River project, Guffey plan of development; 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, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"President of the Senate.
"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"ARTHUR WILSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Senate joint resolution applying to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that membership in both houses of a bicameral state legislature must be apportioned according to population and has thus asserted Federal judicial authority over the basic structure of Government in the various States; and

"Whereas this rule denies to the people of the respective States the right to establish their legislatures upon the same pattern of representation deemed advantageous for the Congress of the United States and provided by the Federal Constitution; and

"Whereas this action of the Supreme Court goes so far as to restrict the ability of the citizens of the respective States to designate the manner in which they shall be represented in their respective legislatures thereby depriving the people of their right to determine how they shall be governed; and

"Whereas the implications of this action by the Supreme Court raise serious doubts as to the legality of the present form of the governing bodies of many subordinate units of government within the States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That this legislature respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Maryland is directed to send duly attested copies of this resolution under the great seal of the State of Maryland to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each Member of the Congress from the State of Maryland."

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

"Whereas the citizens of the United States fought two World Wars to protect the freedom of all people; and

"Whereas an essential freedom of a democratic society is the right to vote; and

"Whereas the minority groups in Alabama have attempted to exercise this right; and

"Whereas these attempts have been thwarted by the use of force, violence and fear by the State government of Alabama; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, That we do respectfully urge that the Congress, the President of the United States and the Attorney General of the United States take immediate action to protect the minority groups in the State of Alabama in their attempt to exercise their right to vote and that an end be brought to the blatant abuse of police power by the State of Alabama which has lead to the recent violence and bloodshed in that State; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives from the State of Washington, to the Vice President, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Attorney General of the United States.

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

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 1

"Memorial urging the Congress of the United States to direct the Veterans' Administration to provide additional facilities in Arizona for the care and hospitalization of qualified veterans

"Your memorialist respectfully represents: The State of Arizona, because of its excellent climate, has attracted many thousands of veterans who have become residents of the State. As a result of such residence, the Veterans' Administration facilities have been used to capacity and an urgent need exists for additional facilities; and

"The shortage of beds in veterans' hospitals within the State of Arizona has resulted in many veterans being accepted for treatment and subsequently they are transferred to facilities in other States where beds are available. However, such action retards recovery of a veteran who prefers to be hospitalized where his relatives and friends are part of the community. Moreover, such action is an unwarranted financial burden to relatives who, in order to be close to the hospitalized veteran, must change their residence.

"Wherefore, your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States give favorable consideration toward the expansion of veterans' facilities in Arizona in order that the ever-increasing number of veterans residing within the State of Arizona may obtain hospitalization within their own community.

"2. That by direction of the Congress the U.S. Veterans' Administration survey the needs of Arizona's veterans and thereby determine whether additional veterans' hospitals and facilities should be constructed or whether additions should be made to existing veterans' facilities.

"3. The secretary of state of Arizona is requested to transmit copies of this memorial to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the President of the U.S. Senate, and to the Administrator of the U.S. Veterans' Administration."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 11

"A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana urging the Federal Government to construct the proposed multipurpose Glacier View Dam on the North Fork of the Flathead River with proper emphasis on flood control and also integrate the flood control and power generating capabilities of Spruce Park and Hungry Horse Dams giving persons and firms in Montana first priority for electric power resulting from development of water resources in the State.

"Whereas additional upstream multiple-purpose storage areas are needed to get full value from water resources of the Columbia River Basin; and

"Whereas the need for additional storage areas arises because the natural runoff pattern from the Columbia River Basin permits the effective use of only a small portion of the flow and because the runoff is in large part the result of melting snow occurring as concentrated floods during a period of 2 or 3 months each spring when peak flows are commonly 10 times those of the low-water season; and

"Whereas large portions of western Montana were devastated by floods during early 1964 and this damage underscores the urgent need for development of water resources which would provide flood control; and

"Whereas protection from these floods cannot be economically provided by dikes, levees or other protective measures, and

"Whereas storage of the water in large multipurpose dams is the most feasible means of catching the floodwaters and holding them for release after the flood peak has passed; and

"Whereas a project to be known as the Glacier View Dam has been proposed to be located on the Flathead River at mile 177 on the western boundary of Glacier National Park, 72 miles upstream from Flathead Lake and 41 miles below the international boundary; and

"Whereas in addition to flood control, Glacier View would also provide hydroelectric power and recreation benefits; and

"Whereas when the project was proposed almost 10 years ago the multipurpose benefits combined to give the project a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.84 to 1; and

"Whereas due to increased needs for flood control, additional demands for electric power and greater needs for recreational facilities, it is probable that the benefit-to-cost ratio of the proposed project would be even more favorable at the present time; and

"Whereas operation of Glacier View Dam, together with Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River, would completely control the floods that cause damage in the Flathead drainage area, and would greatly assist in the control of damaging floods throughout the Columbia River Basin; and

"Whereas construction of Glacier View Dam would not flood any communities, and private property affected would be nominal; and

"Whereas in addition to a more even distribution of power production throughout the year, the Glacier View project would also firm up power production of dams located downstream; and

"Whereas the reservoir created by the dam would inundate about 12,000 acres—only about 1 percent of the total area of Glacier National Park—and would not affect game animals in the Park to any appreciable extent but would enhance recreational use of what is now an area of limited use; and

"Whereas the act of August 22, 1914 (38 Stat. 699) establishing Federal jurisdiction over Glacier National Park provides that beneficial use of water resources has a higher priority than 'reservation of all timber—natural curiosities—and the protection of the animals'; and

"Whereas a logical part of the development of water resources in this area would include a tunnel from the reservoir to be created by Spruce Park Dam to the reservoir created by Hungry Horse Dam; and

"Whereas in addition to enhancing flood control, this diversion would increase production of electric power at Hungry Horse Dam by about one-third and provide for additional power production at existing and proposed plants downstream; and

"Whereas the rapidly increasing population of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation place upon this generation a special responsibility for the maximum utilization of all the great natural resources bestowed upon this Nation by divine providence; and

"Whereas the industrial development of Montana and the Pacific Northwest will be enhanced greatly by the large amounts of low-cost power which can be made available by full development of the proposed Glacier View Dam and also through integrating the development of Spruce Park and Hungry Horse Dams; and

"Whereas consumers within the State of Montana should have first priority in obtaining any electric power generated as a result of development of water resources in Montana; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana: That the Federal Government is urged to provide the necessary legislation to authorize construction of the proposed Glacier View Dam on the North Fork of the Flathead River in Montana and to authorize a sufficient amount of money for detailed planning and construction of Glacier View Dam; be it further

"Resolved, That the Federal Government is urged to also provide the necessary legislation to authorize construction of a tunnel which would link the reservoir which will be created by Spruce Park Dam with that created by Hungry Horse Dam; be it further

"Resolved, That although maximum flood control should be the primary objective of water resource development in northwestern Montana, consumers within the State of Montana should have first priority in obtaining any electric power generated as a result of water resource development in Montana. The Federal Government is, therefore, strongly urged to make such a power reservation when new projects in Montana are authorized or existing projects expanded; be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, to each member of the Montana congressional delegation, to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the Bureau of the Reclamation, to the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Army Engineers, and to the Director of the Budget."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 24

"To the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas in 1950 the Federal Government, on behalf of the Atomic Energy Commission, condemned the Wahluke Slope irrigation project, which constitutes approximately 36,000 acres of the best part of the land in the Columbia basin irrigation project in the State of Washington; and

"Whereas much of the land had been homesteaded by people who wanted to keep it for themselves and their families to develop as irrigated farms; and

"Whereas the land had great value for these citizens; and

"Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission has been successful in improving the safety factor in the area to such an extent that they are now in the process of making this land available for irrigation; and

"Whereas this means that eventually the Government may turn the land over to settlers of their choosing: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington do respectfully petition that the President and Congress direct that the land taken by the Government, or similar land, be returned to the original owners on repayment by them of the condemnation price paid to them by the Government; and be it further

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

"ROBERT M. SCHAEFER,
"Speaker of the House.
"JOHN A. CHERBERG,
"President of the Senate.
"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the chief executive of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands, signed by Seiho Matsuoka, relating to preferential duties on the goods to be imported from the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the international affairs council of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce, Florida, relating to import duties imposed on Americans returning to the United States from abroad; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors, San Mateo County, Calif., relative to the need for a constitutional amendment on reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Chicago, Ill., CORE or the Congress of Racial Equality, signed by Charles Smith, chairman, relating to the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Worcester, Mass., relating to civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Democratic Farmer-Labor Club of the first ward of the city of Minneapolis, protesting against the treatment of civil rights marchers in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15

"Concurrent resolution, memorializing Congress to enact legislation and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to take necessary administrative action to provide for an increase in the disposal price of grain being sold to millers of cereal grains to 120 percent of the support price, and to work toward long-term barter contracts with the underfed nations of the world to purchase American grain

"Whereas the grain surplus in the United States has been reduced by more than 50 percent from 1960 to 1964; and

"Whereas the grain now stored under Government loans constitutes less than 1 year's domestic consumption; and

"Whereas increasing grain production to provide a minimal diet for the world's underfed will provide the foundation for a peaceful and stable world; and

"Whereas increasing grain production will also increase the economic prosperity of the Nation's farming people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to consider the advisability of enacting legislation or taking necessary administrative action to increase the production of cereal grains, to increase the disposal price of grain now being sold to millers of cereal grain to 120 percent of the support price, and to work toward long-term barter contracts with the underfed nations of the

world to purchase American grain: Be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of South Dakota to the secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Congress from this State, and to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

"LEM OVERPECK,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"CHARLES DROZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk."

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16

"Concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose and kill the proposed revolving fund through which farmers and ranchers would make $20 million in payments to the Soil Conservation Service for technical assistance

"Whereas the proposed revolving fund if adopted would seriously slow down the soil and water conservation effort on privately owned lands in South Dakota and the Nation resulting in a 40- to 50-percent reduction in annual application of conservation practices and reduce the quality of practices applied; and

"Whereas State legislatures, county governments, soil and water conservation districts, organizations and individuals over a quarter of a century have been steadily building up their financial contributions to the soil and water conservation effort on privately owned lands. If adopted, this proposal would break faith with State and local governments, soil and water conservation districts, organizations and individuals; and

"Whereas adopting of the revolving fund proposal would be unfair to American landowners. American landowners would be charged for technical assistance which the Federal Government now provides free of charge to people of many foreign lands; and

"Whereas soil conservation, flood control and development of our soil and water resources contribute to the well-being of all the people because they depend upon our limited supplies of soil and water for their daily requirements of food and water that come from well-managed countryside; and

"Whereas adopting of the revolving fund proposal would have a damaging effect upon the conservation and development of the soil and water resources of South Dakota and America because the type of technical assistance now being provided by the Soil Conservation Service is not available anywhere else, even for hire, to provide complete technical assistance for natural resource planning and development, acre-by-acre, farm-by-farm, property-by-property on individual land holdings, watersheds and whole communities; and

"Whereas a revolving fund would increase total conservation cost. A collection system outside the present accepted tax structure would have to be devised. Most farmers and ranchers would need more financial assistance to pay for technical aid to continue conservation and development of soil and water resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States to oppose and kill the revolving fund being proposed by the Bureau of the Budget and restore other recommended budget cuts effecting progress in conservation and development of soil, water and other natural resources: Be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of South Dakota to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"CHARLES DROZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."
"LEM OVERPECK,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MUNDT:

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

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23

"Concurrent resolution requesting the U.S. Corps of Engineers to grant to owners of land adjacent to the Missouri River the exclusive right to lease take-land adjacent to his property, at a fair appraisal price established by the Corps of Engineers, based on the contingency that the landowner retain ownership of the adjacent land, and, if the ownership is terminated by a conveyance of land the right accrue to the subsequent landowner

"Whereas the U.S. Corps of Engineers in its negotiations with the original lessee of take-land along the Missouri River has adopted the policy of giving the original lessee exclusive long-term leases to said take-land with the right of renewal regardless of the fact of ownership interest in adjacent or contingent land; and

"Whereas said policy has adverse affects on subsequent landowners of adjacent lands by precluding them from any opportunity to lease adjacent take-land; and

"Whereas the policy of the Corps of Engineers of precluding adjacent landowners from having access to the waters of the Missouri River causes subsequent landowners undue physical and financial hardship: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the U.S. Corps of Engineers consider granting to each owner of land adjacent to the Missouri River the exclusive right to lease take-land adjacent to his property, at a fair appraisal price established by the Corps of Engineers, said lease to be based on the contingency that the landowner retain ownership of said adjacent land, and, if said lease be terminated by a conveyance of land, said right accrue to the subsequent landowner; and be it further

"Resolved, That in the event the adjacent landowner does not lease the take-land at the appraised value, the same right be then granted to the highest bidder subject to all conditions deemed necessary by the Corps of Engineers; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Army of the United States; to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army at Omaha, Nebr.; to the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, and the Honorable GEORGE MCGOVERN, U.S. Senators from South Dakota; and to the Honorable E. Y. BERRY and the Honorable BEN REIFEL, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota.

"Attest:

"CHARLES DROZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"LEM OVERPECK,
"Lieutenant Governor,
"President of the Senate.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10

"A concurrent resolution memoralizing the Congress of the United States to direct the Area Redevelopment Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Mines and Office of Minerals Exploration of the Department of the Interior of the United States to undertake a study of the feasibility of establishing metallurgical research operations and to explore mineral resources in the Black Hills of South Dakota

"Whereas the Black Hills of South Dakota are abundant in precious minerals and nonferrous metals and that these natural resources should be mined and processed; and

"Whereas that during the early history of the State of South Dakota, a great interest was shown in mining and great wealth was produced as a result of taking ores from the ground; and

"Whereas the Black Hills of South Dakota is an area that needs a redeveloping and a rebirth of her once tremendous mining industry; and

"Whereas a study of the feasibility of establishing metallurgical research operations could result in a plant being constructed in the Black Hills of South Dakota creating job opportunity and industrial development; and

"Whereas valuable mineral resources are known to exist in the Black Hills of South Dakota, the extent and exact location of which could be determined by the Office of Minerals Exploration of the Department of the Interior of the United States; and

"Whereas it is anticipated that the results of such a study will be of great economic benefit to South Dakota and its people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and is, memorialized to direct the Area Redevelopment Administration of the United States Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Mines and Office of Minerals Exploration of the Department of the Interior of the United States to undertake a study of the feasibility of establishing metallurgical research operations and to explore mineral resources in the Black Hills of the State of South Dakota; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Members of the congressional delegation from South Dakota, the Area Redevelopment Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Interior of the United States, the Office of Minerals Exploration of the Department of the Interior of the

United States, and to the Industrial Development Expansion Agency, Pierre, S. Dak.

"Adopted by the Senate March 1, 1965.

"Concurred in by the House of Representatives March 11, 1965.

"CHARLES DROZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"LEM OVERPECK,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

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

"Attest:

"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, for myself and my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], I send to the desk enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, a concurrent resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature, in support of the enactment of legislation to establish an Ozarka regional development program, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States has passed, and the President has signed into law, legislation for the development of the Appalachia region. The President of the United States in his state of the Union message to the Congress and his messages on the budget and on agriculture indicated his support for the extension of the regional development idea to other areas of the Nation.

There is no area of America which has more abundant natural resources, greater natural beauty, and more undeveloped potential than does the Ozarka region of eastern Oklahoma, western Arkansas, and southern Missouri.

Due to the hard work and ingenuity of the hearty people of this region, great developmental progress is being made. But, Mr. President, as in the Appalachia region, if the chronic unemployment and the poverty-level family incomes of this region are to be corrected—and they must be corrected, unless we are willing to see these human and natural resources wasted—we cannot do so by county planning or State planning.

We must move now toward the regional planning and development of this entire area.

The Ozarka region is contiguous, homogeneous in terrain and resources and problems. The region is living under the common burden of past exploitation of its natural resources, depletion of its soil, and wasting of its water. It suffers from inadequate roads and highways. These problems cannot be met by private action alone, nor by local or State action alone, nor by the Federal Government alone. They must be met head-on and solved by the joint and cooperative effort of private and local, State and Federal action, which can only be accomplished through the congressional establishment of an Ozarka Regional Development Commission and the appropriation of funds for the necessary planning and study.

This need is made more acute by the imminent 1970 completion date of the Arkansas River navigation project, which will bring navigation from the Gulf of Mexico, through the heart of this region, to a point near Tulsa, Okla. If all of the potentialities for new private jobs, new industry, new tourism, and new general economic growth are to be realized, orderly planning under the auspices of an Ozarka Regional Development Commission is urgently required.

Therefore, Mr. President, I commend the Oklahoma legislature for its approval of this project. I commend the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and that committee for their interest. I commend the President of the United States, to whose staff member, Mr. Lee White, I have especially sent a copy of this resolution, for his support of the regional development concept.

I am glad to join with my distinguished colleagues from Arkansas and Missouri in urging the early approval of the Ozarka Regional Development Commission.

Further, I am most pleased to see that in the message of the President of the United States on ARA received in the Senate today, recognition is given to the needs of Oklahoma and Arkansas by name, that the extension of the regional planning concept is asked and an appropriation of $15 million is requested for additional regional planning commissions to be established. I especially commend the President of the United States for this portion of his message.

We in Oklahoma are ready to get underway in the more rapid development of the Ozarka region.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 26

Concurrent resolution extending the support of the Oklahoma Legislature to the Congress of the United States for the enactment of legislation for the Ozarka Regional Development Program; and directing distribution of this resolution to the appropriate United States officials

Whereas the Congress of the United States has established the policy of supporting economic development in sections of the country which fall behind the national average in per capita income and employment through the enactment of the Area Redevelopment Act and the Public Works Acceleration Act and its present consideration of the Appalachian Regional Development Bill; and

Whereas the President of the United States has, in his State of the Union address and in his messages to the Congress on the Budget and Agriculture, indicated his continued support for such a policy; and

Whereas U.S. Senator FRED R. HARRIS and members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation have proposed an "Ozarka" regional development program for eastern Oklahoma and neighboring States similar to that now under consideration by the Congress for the Appalachian Mountain region; and

Whereas the formulation and implementation of an economic development plan for "Ozarka" will require complete cooperation among the Federal, state, and local governments as well as businessmen, farmers, and working people in the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That this legislature hereby indicates its support for the enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States to extend the regional development concept to the Eastern Oklahoma "Ozarka" region and commends its representatives in Congress for their efforts in support of such a program; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the expressed intent of this Legislature that the State of Oklahoma and the agencies and subdivisions thereof lend all possible aid, assistance, and cooperation in the formation of an Ozarka Regional Development Program to include a portion of the State of Oklahoma; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of senate is hereby directed to forward appropriate copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Honorable PAT MCNAMARA, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, and the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the House Public Works Committee, and to the members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, each of whom is commended for his past efforts and further encouraged to support the planning and implementation of an Ozarka regional development program.

Adopted by the Senate the 4th day of March 1965.

CLEETA JOHN ROGERS,
Acting President of the Senate.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 10th day of March 1965.

J. D. MCCARTY,
Speaker of the House of the Representatives.

Attest:

BASIL R. WILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION 18

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation necessary to continue the center operated by the Veterans' Administration at Bath, N.Y.

"Whereas in a supposed economy move by the Secretary of Defense, it is planned to abandon the Veterans' Administration Center at Bath, N.Y.; and

"Whereas these facilities have been in operation either by our own great State or the Federal Government since 1877 to give medical treatment, care and comfort for our deserving war heroes, especially the aged veterans; and

"Whereas these veterans who have been cared for in the past and those now being aided at Bath were willing, when our great Nation was endangered by the foe, to make the supreme sacrifice, it is only just that we demonstrate some sacrifice on all our parts at this time; and

"Whereas it seems justifiable at this time, in making sacrifices, that our war veterans be first considered rather than last; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration at Bath is the only home for aged veterans in the Northeastern United States and its location is excellent, geographically, from a civilian defense standpoint; and

"Whereas to abandon these facilities at this time would do great hardship to our veterans and prove economically unsound: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby

is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation with convenient speed, that will prevent the Secretary of Defense from pursuing his course to abandon the Veterans' Administration Center at Bath, N.Y.; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

"By order of the assembly,

"JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
"Clerk.

"Concurred in with amendments, March 3, 1965.

"By order of the senate:

"GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Senate amendments concurred in, March 8, 1965.

"By order of the assembly:

"JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
"Clerk."

"RESOLUTION 37

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary legislation to provide for the establishment and erection of a veterans hospital in Monroe County

"Whereas the Batavia Veterans Hospital is a 257-bed hospital which was originally planned, long before World War II, to take care of World War I and Spanish-American War veterans in the Buffalo-Rochester area. At that period the facility was adequate. However, since the end of World War II and the Korean conflict, with an additional 18,000,000 veterans added to the list of those entitled to hospitalization, a hospital expansion program was essential. This resulted in the city of Buffalo getting a hospital, as well as Syracuse and Albany, Rochester being bypassed as it was assumed that the old 257-bed Batavia Veterans Hospital would be adequate for the needs of Rochester area veterans; and

"Whereas this is a gross inequity to Rochester area veterans as they number 100,000 in the metropolitan area (80,000 in the Rochester area) including veterans from all wars. The Batavia Veterans Hospital is nowhere near adequate enough for their needs. At any given time, the Batavia Veterans Hospital has a Rochester veteran population of 80 to 85 percent. Also many veterans in the Rochester area who must obtain a treatment not handled at Batavia, are sent to the Buffalo facility at great inconvenience. Rochester area veterans find it difficult to understand why a city of their size, the 23d in the Nation, should lack proper medical and hospital facilities freely given to communities much smaller; and

"Whereas Rochester area veterans have to journey a minimum of 38 miles to get to the Batavia Hospital which creates a definite hardship on the next of kind who would like to visit them. The Buffalo Veterans Hospital is 70 miles away, which increases the hardship. The only nearby facility of a general medical nature is the Bath Veterans Hospital situated 75 miles away; and

"Whereas the Batavia Veterans Hospital is situated in a rural county having a population of approximately 8,000, placing a veterans hospital in the Rochester area in the center of veteran population would equalize the present hospital program across the State, with a facility in Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, and Albany. This represents the great central population belt in this State, second only to the New York City metropolitan area itself; and

"Whereas to further justify the building of a hospital in the Rochester area is the dogmatic fact that the city is a well-known medical center which would simplify the hospital staffing problem making it easy to provide every type of medical facility currently available; and

"Whereas the bed capacity of all veteran hospitals in western New York with the exception of Canandaigua, which is neuropsychiatric, totals only 1,481 beds divided as follows:

Batavia Veterans Hospital	257
Bath Veterans Hospital	273
Buffalo Veterans Hospital	951

Of these hospitals, only Batavia is even remotely convenient (38 miles distant) and this is the smallest hospital of them all, totaling only 257 beds. When you consider that Syracuse has a 488-bed general-medical hospital, and Albany has a 1,000-bed general-medical hospital, it is difficult to reconcile ourselves to the fact that Rochester has no hospital whatsoever, and must depend primarily on a 257-bed hospital, 30 years old and 83 miles away; and

"Whereas the Buffalo VA Hospital has all it can do to take care of its own veteran residents which number a quarter million, including Niagara Falls and adjoining towns. We do not think that this facility answers our problem at all. Where Rochester area veterans, after discharge from a VA hospital, are eligible for certain periods of outpatient treatment and medication at the hospital, they are frequently unable to avail themselves of this additional benefit due to cost and inconvenience of travel; and

"Whereas the Monroe County Board of Supervisors has donated enough land owned by Monroe County to the Federal Government for the purpose of establishing a VA hospital; and

"Whereas this land is close by the renowned Strong Memorial Hospital and the University of Rochester Medical School, with continually visiting specialists of the medical profession from all parts of the world who might be sufficiently interested to review any rare ailment of a veteran hospitalized: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is respectively memorialized by the Legislature of the State of New York to enact legislation for the establishment, erection, and maintenance of a veterans hospital in Monroe County; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

"By order of the assembly:

"JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
"Clerk.

"Concurred in without amendment, March 3, 1965.

"By order of the senate:

"GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
"Secretary."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a copy of a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations memorializing Congress to repeal the Federal tax on jewelry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

H. 1117

Resolution memorializing Congress to repeal the Federal tax on jewelry

Whereas the Congress of the United States did in the year 1954 impose a tax on jewelry sold at retail equivalent to 10 percent of the selling price; and

Whereas the aforesaid tax was imposed during the Korean emergency to discourage the manufacture of jewelry, and the reason for the imposition of said tax no longer exists; and

Whereas the imposition of said tax has placed a great burden on the domestic jewelry industry already beset by low-wage foreign competitions and increasing tariff barriers against jewelry exports; and

Whereas the manufacturing of jewelry and related products is one of the leading industries of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations providing employment for many of its citizens; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States be and they hereby are respectfully requested to repeal the Federal tax on the sale of jewelry at retail; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he hereby is requested to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution in the hope that each will use his best efforts to enact legislation to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF MAINE LEGISLATURE

By Mrs. SMITH (for herself and Mr. MUSKIE):

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 452

"Joint resolution proposing abolition of futures trading of potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange by the Congress of the United States

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 102d legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress may regulate commerce among the several States; and

"Whereas potatoes are now traded in futures contracts on the New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York City, N.Y.; and

"Whereas the price at which future contracts are bought and sold has a direct and immediate effect on cash prices received by producers for potatoes in Maine and all other areas producing potatoes for market; and

"Whereas futures prices reflect the effects of manipulation and unlimited speculation to the detriment of producers of potatoes; and

"Whereas futures trading of potatoes obstructs all attempts of Maine potato producers to market their product in an orderly fashion; and

"Whereas futures trading of potatoes encourages overproduction in Maine and all other producing areas with resulting disastrously low prices for the producers; and

"Whereas experience has proven that futures trading can be carried on without detrimental and depressing effect on price only in the case of those commodities which can be stored for extensive periods of time either within the areas of production or the areas of marketing and distribution; and

"Whereas Irish potatoes are a perishable commodity that do not lend themselves to extended periods of storage, especially following preparation for market; and

"Whereas Irish potatoes historically are one of the most volatile commodities in terms of price range and in degree of sensitivity to myriad market factors, including total volume produced, anticipated production, available supply on track and in the marketplaces, as well as many others; and

"Whereas many areas of production have vehemently registered their opposition to the continued trading of Irish potatoes futures, either with or without the supervision of the Commodity Exchange Authority of the USDA, and producers in Maine, by mail ballot, have voted overwhelmingly in favor of abolishing futures trading in Maine potatoes; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has already established a precedent for the action to be proposed by this resolution in the instance of another perishable commodity, namely onions, leaving potatoes as the only perishable commodity now being traded on the futures market: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, your memorialists, recommend that the Congress enact legislation abolishing futures trading in Irish potatoes upon the New York Mercantile Exchange or upon any commodity exchange; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of State, by mail, to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"In senate chamber: Read and adopted, sent down for concurrence, March 5, 1965; ordered sent forthwith.

"EDWIN H. PERT,
"Secretary.

"House of representatives: Read and adopted in concurrence, March 9, 1965.

"JEROME G. PLANTE,
"Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 451

"Joint resolution requesting Members of Congress to support the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service

"Whereas the preservation of the soils, water, forests and wildlife of this Nation, and in particular the topsoil, is necessary; and

"Whereas we believe the preservation of these resources is a responsibility of all people; and

"Whereas farmers and landowners through conservation practices have made Maine a far more beautiful State for both rural and urban people to enjoy; and

"Whereas the agricultural conservation program and the technical assistance provided the landowners of Maine by the Soil Conservation Service are a vital link in the overall natural resource conservation movement through the State; and

"Whereas for the past 30 years the U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service, has done much to maintain and improve these resources, and make landowners and society in general more conscious of the need for such preservation; and

"Whereas during this period some 25,000 Maine farmers and landowners have put to good use the many conservation practices of the agricultural conservation program; and

"Whereas in carrying out these practices Maine farmers and landowners are now more than matching Government funds dollar for dollar; and

"Whereas, through the medium of agricultural conservation program farmer-elected committeemen and soil conservation district supervisors throughout the State, farm leadership has been developed to a most helpful degree; and

"Whereas we believe that farmers, particularly through this defense period, should not be forced to exploit their soils in the production of the additional food and fiber needed; and

"Whereas we firmly believe that such would become a necessity should funds to operate the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service be curtailed: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the 102d legislature, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to give the necessary and adequate support to the continuance of the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service; and be it further

"Resolved, That Maine Senators EDMUND S. MUSKIE and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and the State Representatives in Congress, WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY and STANLEY R. TUPPER, be asked to give their wholehearted support to the agricultural conservation program, and to vote to continue the annual national appropriation of $250 million for the agricultural conservation program, and to restore the recommended cut of $20 million in Soil Conservation Service funds; and be it further

"Resolved, That an adequate amount be set aside from such appropriation to make it possible to administer the program through the present system of farmer-elected committeemen; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit duly attested copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Maine congressional delegation.

"In senate chamber: Read and adopted, sent down for concurrence, March 5, 1965.

"EDWIN H. PERT,
"Secretary.

"House of representatives: Read and adopted in concurrence, March 9, 1965.

"JEROME G. PLANTE,
"Clerk."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 390. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second class and third class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations (Rept. No. 129).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments—Supplement, January 4, 1965" (Rept. No. 139);

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of House Document Numbered 103 of the Eighty-sixth Congress (Rept. No. 131);

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn of Texas (Rept. No. 132);

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled, "Our American Government. What Is Is? How Does It Function?" (Rept. No. 133);

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of inaugural addresses from President Washington to President Johnson, and providing for additional copies (Rept. No. 134);

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill (Rept. No. 135);

H. Con. Res.167. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a study of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs (Rept. No. 137);

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the publication as a House document of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839) (Rept. No. 138); and

S. Res. 89. Resolution authorizing attendance at the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Wellington, New Zealand (Rept. No. 130).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document No. 103 of the 88th Congress; with an amendment (Rept. No. 136).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1462. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 140).

NAN B. TWIFORD—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 94) to pay a gratuity to Nan B. Twiford, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Nan B. Twiford, aunt of Adele R. O'Connor, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 11 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE ON FOREIGN CURRENCY AND U.S. DOLLARS USED 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 Commerce concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by those committees 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 Commerce, U.S. Senate, 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
Bartlett, E. L.:											
Japan	Yen	70,200	195.00	65,520	182.00			42,120	117.00	177,840	494.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,320	1,087.06			4,320	1,087.06
Subtotal			195.00		182.00		1,087.06		117.00		1,581.06
Kenney, Jeremiah J., Jr.:											
France	New franc	443.20	88.64	395	79.00	60	12.00	14.80	2.96	913	182.60
Germany	Deutsche mark					2,527.60	631.90			2,527.60	631.90
Subtotal			88.64		79.00		643.90		2.96		814.50
Markel, Daniel B.:											
France	New franc	604.10	120.82	587.15	117.43	174	34.80	114.75	22.95	1,480	296.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					2,523.80	630.95			2,523.80	630.95
Subtotal			120.82		117.43		665.75		22.95		926.95
Scott, Hugh:											
New Zealand	U.S. dollar		105.00		75.00				4.00		184.00
Fiji	do		40.00		30.00						70.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					XXXX.92	1,667.40			6,627.92	1,667.40
Subtotal			145.00		105.00		1,667.40		4.00		1,921.40
Total			549.46		483.43		4,064.11		146.91		5,243.91

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$4,989.91
Appropriated funds: S. Res. 283	254.00
Total	5,243.91

MARCH 23, 1965.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1598. A bill for the relief of Jean Kathleen Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1599. A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1600. A bill for the relief of certain members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1601. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1602. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 for the purpose of enabling the Federal Aviation Agency to provide air traffic control services which will be adequate to meet the needs of civil aviation and the national defense, and to safeguard air traffic against the hazard of mid-air collision; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1603. A bill for the relief of Raymond C. Dudley; and

S. 1604. A bill to incorporate the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1605. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1606. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal crime to assault or kill any employee of the Department of Agriculture or the Public Health Service when such employee is engaged in certain inspection duties at ports of entry or border stations of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1607. A bill to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1608. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1609. A bill to amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act;

S. 1610. A bill to establish a register of blind persons in the District of Columbia; to provide for the mandatory reporting of information concerning such persons, and for other purposes;

S. 1611. A bill to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes:

S. 1612. A bill to establish a Board of Higher Education to plan, establish, organize, and operate a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1613. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia and to supplement the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia in order to provide for the indemnification of persons sustaining injuries or damages as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by financially irresponsible persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1614. A bill to designate Vietnam as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes, effective retroactively to January 1, 1961; and

S. 1615. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives for the support of educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1616. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen sheep or goats in interstate or foreign commerce and for persons selling or receiving stolen sheep or goats transported in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1617. A bill to provide for a temporary moratorium on payments under FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages for mortgagors who are unemployed as the result of the closing of a Federal installation, and for other purposes; and

S. 1618. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain housing owned by servicemen at or near Federal bases or installations which have been, or are being, closed in whole or in part; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1619. A bill to permit members and former members of the Armed Forces retired on or after October 1, 1963, for physical disabilities incurred as a direct result of armed conflict to have their retirement pay recomputed whenever the rates of basic pay applicable to the grade in which they retired are increased; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1620. A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1621 A bill to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act with respect to the interconnection of electric facilities; and

S. 1622. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER) (by request):

S. 1623. A bill to amend the Act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1624. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small-business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance, repair, or construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1625. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax-exempt organizations to engage in certain activities for the purpose of influencing legislation directly relevant to the purposes which qualify such organizations for tax exemption, without losing certain benefits under that Code; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MILLER):

S. 1626. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals and the closing of such hospitals: to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1627. A bill for the relief of David R. Boylan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1628. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the Act of February 13, 1911, to eliminate those provisions which require payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MUSKIE (by request):

S. 1629. A bill designating the birthday of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1630. A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1631. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Clark County, Nev., to Francis W. Thorne; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1632. A bill to require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1633. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to authorize a program to improve safety on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems of highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. LAUSCHE, and Mr. DOMINICK):

S. 1634. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S. 1635. A bill to require annual approval by the Congress of aggregate amounts of expenditure authorizations contained in general appropriation acts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. MUNDT:

S.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the period from August 31, through September 6, in 1965 as National American Legion Baseball Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

PROMOTION OF PEACE AND SECURITY IN SOUTHEASTERN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. INOUYE) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) to promote peace and security in southeast Asia and the Pacific, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

HONOR OF VICTORY OVER POLIOMYELITIS

Mr. HILL submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Whereas April 12, 1965, is the tenth anniversary of one of the most significant medical achievements of our time, Doctor Jonas Salk's development of a successful vaccine against poliomyelitis; and

Whereas in the ten years since the introduction of the Salk vaccine, there has been a 99 per centum reduction in the number of cases of polio in the United States; and

Whereas this dread disease which once attacked as many as fifty-seven thousand Americans in a single year and made the summer months a time of fear and apprehension for parents across the Nation, has now been eliminated as a public health problem; and

Whereas this great medical victory was won through a unique partnership between the American people and medical scientists like Doctor Salk, under the auspices of the National Foundation-March of Dimes, and with the outstanding cooperation of the United States Public Health Service; and

Whereas a leading example of how this partnership is continuing and expanding is the Salk Institute for Biological Studies in La Jolla, California; and

Whereas this institute was conceived as a research center where scientists of international reputation could come and map out the high strategy of man's fight for health; and

Whereas Doctor Salk and his colleagues from all over the world are now at work on projects aimed at discovering the basic concept of life itself; and

Whereas from this research can flow the specific methods to control disease and to promote the health and better understanding of man and his full potential: Now be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Jonas Salk and the National Foundation-March of Dimes be congratulated on this tenth anniversary of the announcement of the world's first effective vaccine against

polio, and our confidence be expressed that the work of the National Foundation-March of Dimes—specifically its fight against birth defects—and of the Salk Institute for Biological Studies will bring about the blessings of better health for our society and all its citizens.

RESOLUTIONS

STUDY OF RECREATION IN THE LAKE TEXOMA AREA

Mr. TOWER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 91) calling for a study of recreation in the Lake Texoma area, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. TOWER, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "FRAUDS AND DECEPTIONS AFFECTING THE ELDERLY, INVESTIGATIONS, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS, 1964"

Mr. SMATHERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 92) to permit reprint of Committee on Aging's Report entitled "Frauds and Deceptions Affecting the Elderly, Investigations, Findings, and Recommendations, 1964," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging six thousand additional copies of its committee print of the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Frauds and Deceptions Affecting the Elderly, Investigations, Findings and Recommendations: 1964," a report by the Subcommittee on Frauds and Misrepresentations Affecting the Elderly.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF SENATE ON BRIEFING OF SENATORS GENERALLY CONCERNING SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 93) to express sense of Senate on briefing of Senators generally concerning situation in Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. COOPER, which appears under a separate heading.)

NAN B. TWIFORD

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 94) to pay a gratuity to Nan B. Twiford, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, the bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development submitted to the Senate today by President Johnson. This is the administration's bill the President called for in his message on cities "to give greater force and effectiveness to our effort in the cities."

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for the remainder of this week in order that Senators who wish to do so might join as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill together with a section-by-section summary of it be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD after the summary of the bill a report prepared at my request by James R. King of the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service entitled "Congressional Action Related to the Proposed Establishment of an Executive Department, Office, or Commission to Deal With Problems of Urban Areas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred. Without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD; and the requests of the Senator from Connecticut are granted.

The bill (S. 1599) to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, long ago it was said that "barbarians build their houses separate, but civilized men together." Through the course of modern history the city has indeed become the focal point, not only of our society here in America, but throughout modern Western civilization as well.

Ours is an urban society. Already the great majority of Americans live in cities and their suburbs. By the year 2000 over four-fifths of our 350 million people will live in large, metropolitan groupings. Already the bulk of our Nation's wealth is created day by day in our urban areas. The health of our society hinges on the well-being and progress of our cities and suburbs and the people who live in them.

But our cities and suburbs are in trouble. The costs of local services are rising at an alarming rate. Local taxes this year are running about 140 percent higher than just 15 years ago. They are continuing to rise, and the same is true of State taxes. The burden on local governments to meet the need for more services grows heavier day after day, week after week, month after month. And there is no end in sight to the need for more schools, more highways, more hospitals, more sewerage and water facilities, and more and better programs to house our urban population and improve our communities.

No more complex and pressing problem faces us than the problem of how to help our local communities, large and small, to meet their urgent needs today and prepare to meet even greater burdens which loom on the horizon.

That is what this bill is all about. We should create an executive department to represent the urban population, their cities and suburban communities at the Cabinet table so the problems of an urbanized America are considered at the proper level of government. The existing Agency—the Housing and Home Finance Agency—was created 18 years ago to coordinate two programs—the mortgage insurance program of the Federal Housing Administration and the program of Federal aid to local communities to provide public housing for low-income families.

Since then a vast range of entirely new programs has been given to the Agency to administer. Congress has recognized the problems of urbanization and made provision for the solution of many of them. But it has up to now ignored the question of the proper administration of some 40 Federal programs for community development that are now available to our urban areas. It is now time for us to take the reasonable and logical step of creating a Department that can—with far more efficiency, economy, and authority—administer to the complexity that is our urbanized Nation.

We must keep in mind, as the President has reminded us, that our urbanization is not defined in terms of numbers alone. We are talking about more than geography and numbers; we are talking about a way of life—and the social facts are as important and more so than the numerical definitions. These urban ways of living will be the subject of utmost concern to the new department being proposed today.

We must try, through this new Agency, to focus on what President Johnson has described as the core of the urban problem—the quality of the lives of the people living in our urban areas.

We are not dealing with the problems of the city dweller alone but the problems of American society itself. During the 10 years that this proposition has been before Congress—this decade of deliberation—a new generation of slum children has reached school age. The pollution of water supplies and 350,000 tons of smog a day still threaten our very health and safety. Clogged city streets and inadequate transportation facilities still plague the downtown shopper and commuter. Roadside slum towns, junkyards and neon nightmares disgrace us and even raise some question of how civilized we really are in comparison to the barbarian who built his house separate.

This new department will not be able to answer all the questions or solve all the problems that are associated with urbanization, but it can offer a start. It can become home base for the "enormous growth of interest and knowledge and intellectual ferment" that the Presi-

dent asked to be continued and expanded "as we painfully struggle to identify the ills, the dangers, and the cures for the American city."

Mr. President, there has been talk enough. Now is the time for action. I consider passage of this bill to be minimum recognition by Congress of the long and difficult path that our citizens have been treading, sometimes quite alone, toward a high quality of urban life. They need our attention; they need our help; and as servants of the public interest we can do no less than meet the needs of the 135 million Americans who happen to live in urban America.

Mr. President, I wish to announce that hearings on S. 1599 and other related bills will be held in room 1318 of the New Senate Office Building on March 31 and April 1 beginning at 10 a.m. The leadoff witness will be Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Kermit Gordon. Groups and individuals who wish to be heard should contact Mr. Jerome Sonosky, staff director of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, room 162, Senate Office Building, extension 2308.

The bill (S. 1599), summary, and report, presented by Mr. RIBICOFF, are as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Housing and Urban Development Act".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of our people require, as a matter of national purpose, sound development of the Nation's urban communities and metropolitan areas in which the vast majority of its people live and work.

To carry out such purpose, and in recognition of the increasing importance of housing and urban development in our national life, the Congress finds that establishment of an executive department is desirable to achieve the best administration of the principal programs of the Federal Government which provide assistance for housing and for the development of the Nation's communities; to assist the President in achieving maximum coordination of the various Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban, suburban, or metropolitan development; to encourage the solution of problems of housing and urban development through State, county, town, village, or other local and private action, including promotion of interstate, regional, and metropolitan cooperation; and to provide for full and appropriate consideration, at the national level, of the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and of the people who live and work in them.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"). There shall be at the head of the Department a Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Department shall be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Secretary shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments.

(b) The Secretary shall, among his responsibilities, advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to housing and urban development; develop and recommend to the President policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas; exercise leadership at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting housing and urban development; provide technical assistance and information including a clearinghouse service to aid State, county, town, village, or other local governments in developing solutions to urban and metropolitan development problems; encourage comprehensive planning by the State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and local urban development activities, and conduct continuing comprehensive studies, and make available findings, with respect to the problems of housing and urban development.

(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to deny or limit the benefits of any program, function, or activity assigned to the Department by this or any other Act to any community on the basis of its population or corporate status, except as may be expressly provided by law.

UNDER SECRETARY AND OTHER OFFICERS

SEC. 4. (a) There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for under secretaries, assistant secretaries, and general counsels, respectively, of executive departments, and who shall perform such functions, powers, and duties as the Secretary shall prescribe from time to time.

(b) There shall be in the Department an Assistant Secretary for Administration, who shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary under the classified civil service, who shall perform such functions, powers, and duties as the Secretary shall prescribe from time to time, and whose annual rate of compensation shall be the same as that now or hereafter provided by or pursuant to law for assistant secretaries for administration of executive departments.

TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT

SEC. 5. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to and vested in the Secretary all of the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, of the Federal Housing Administration and the Public Housing Administration in that Agency, and of the heads and other officers and offices of said agencies.

(b) The Federal National Mortgage Association, together with its functions, powers, and duties, is hereby transferred to the Department. The next to the last sentence of section 308 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act and the item numbered (94) of section 303(e) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 are hereby repealed, and the position of the President of said Association is hereby allocated among the positions referred to in section 7(c) hereof.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 6. (a) Section 19(d)(1) of title 3 of the United States Code is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a comma and the following: "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development."

(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 1) is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"Eleventh. The Department of Housing and Urban Development."

(c) The amendment made by subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to make applicable to the Department any provision of law inconsistent with this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 7. (a) The personnel employed in connection with, and the assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, or other funds held, used, arising from, or available or to be made available in connection with, the functions, powers, and duties transferred by section 5 of this Act are hereby transferred with such functions, powers, and duties, respectively.

(b) No transfer of functions, powers, and duties shall at any time be made within the Department in connection with the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association unless the Secretary finds that the rights and interests of owners of outstanding common stock issued under the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act will not be adversely affected thereby.

(c) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the civil service and classification laws, to select, appoint, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and to prescribe their authority and duties: *Provided,* That any other provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding, the Secretary may fix the compensation for not more than six positions in the Department at the annual rate applicable to positions in level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule provided by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964.

(d) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions, powers, and duties to such officers and employees of the Department as he may designate, may authorize such successive redelegations of such functions, powers, and duties as he may deem desirable, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. The second proviso of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is hereby repealed.

(e) The Secretary may obtain services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946, at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals.

(f) The Secretary is authorized to establish a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of such common administrative services as he shall find to be desirable in the interest of economy and efficiency in the Department, including such services as a central supply service for stationery and other supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part the requirements of the Department and its agencies; central messenger, mail, [redacted], and other communications services; office space; central services for document reproduction and for graphics and visual aids; and a central library service. In addition to amounts appropriated to provide capital for said fund, which appropriations are hereby authorized, the fund shall be capitalized by transfer to it of such stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order as the Secretary shall direct. Such fund shall be reimbursed from available funds of agencies and offices in the Department for which services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and for depreciation of equipment.

(g) The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of such device as he shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of such seal.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year,

make a report to the President for submission to the Congress on the activities of the Department during the preceding calendar year.

SAVINGS PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) No cause of action by or against any agency whose functions are transferred by this Act, or by or against any officer of any such agency in his official capacity, shall abate by reason of this enactment. Such causes of action may be asserted by or against the United States or such official of the Department as may be appropriate.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding commenced by or against any agency whose functions are transferred by this Act, or by or against any officer of any such agency in his official capacity, shall abate by reason of the enactment of this Act. A court may at any time during the pendency of the litigation, on its own motion or that of any party, order that the same may be maintained by or against the United States or such official of the Department as may be appropriate.

(c) Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this Act, all powers and authorities conferred by this Act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. All rules, regulations, orders, authorizations, delegations, or other actions duly issued, made, or taken by or pursuant to applicable law, prior to the effective date of this Act, by any agency, officer, or office pertaining to any functions, powers, and duties transferred by this Act shall continue in full force and effect after the effective date of this Act until modified or rescinded by the Secretary or such other officer or office of the Department as, in accordance with applicable law, may be appropriate. With respect to any function, power, or duty transferred by or under this Act and exercised hereafter, reference in another Federal law to the Housing and Home Finance Agency or to any officer, office, or agency therein, except the Federal National Mortgage Association and its officers, shall be deemed to mean the Secretary. The positions and agencies heretofore established by law in connection with the functions, powers, and duties transferred under section 5(a) of this Act shall lapse.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other evidence of the intent of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that if any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this Act or its application to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provision of this Act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND INTERIM APPOINTMENTS

SEC. 11. (a) The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days following the date on which this Act is approved by the President, or on such earlier date as the President shall specify by Executive order published in the Federal Register, except that any of the officers provided for in sections 3(a), 4(a), and 4(b) of this Act may be nominated and appointed, as provided in such sections, at any time after the date this Act is approved by the President.

(b) In the event that one or more officers required by this Act to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall not have entered upon office on the effective date of this Act, the President may designate any person who was an officer of the Housing and Home Finance Agency immediately prior to said effective date to act in such office until the office is filled as provided in this Act or until the expiration of the first period of sixty days following said effective date, whichever shall first occur. While so acting such persons shall receive compensation at the rates provided by this Act for the respective offices in which they act.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SHORT TITLE

Section 1 provides that the act would be cited as the "Department of Housing and Urban Development Act."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Section 2 sets forth the purpose of the bill and that the Congress finds that establishment of an executive department is desirable to carry out the purpose.

Congress would declare that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require, as a matter of national purpose, sound development of the Nation's urban communities and metropolitan areas in which the vast majority of its people live and work.

To carry out the purpose, Congress would find that establishment of an executive department is desirable to (1) achieve the best administration of the principal programs of the Federal Government which provide assistance for housing and for the development of the Nation's communities; (2) assist the President in achieving maximum coordination of Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban, suburban, or metropolitan development; (3) encourage the solution of problems of housing and urban development through State, county, town, village, or other local and private action (including promotion of interstate, regional, and metropolitan cooperation); and (4) provide for full consideration, at the national level, of the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and their people.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT—RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY

Section 3(a) establishes the Department of Housing and Urban Development and provides that it would be headed by a Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who would be appointed by the President with Senate confirmation.

The Department would be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Secretary would receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments. (At present, under sec. 303(a) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, the secretaries of departments receive $35,000 per annum.)

Section 3(b) directs the Secretary, among his other responsibilities, to advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to housing and urban development; to develop and recommend to the President policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas; exercise leadership at the discretion of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting housing and urban development; provide technical assistance and information (including a clearinghouse service) to aid State, county, town, village, or other local governments in developing solutions to urban and metropolitan development problems; encourage comprehensive planning by State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and local urban development activities; and to conduct continuing studies of housing and urban development problems.

Section 3(c) provides that nothing in the bill shall be construed to deny or limit the benefits of any program, function, or activity to any community on the basis of its population or corporate status, except as may be expressly provided by law.

UNDER SECRETARY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Section 4(a) provides that there shall be in the Department an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel, all of whom would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. These officers would perform the functions, powers, and duties prescribed by the Secretary. They would receive the same compensation as the under secretaries, assistant secretaries, and general counsels of other departments. (At present, under sec. 303(c) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, under secretaries receive $28,500 per annum, and under sec. 303(d) of that act, assistant secretaries and general counsels receive $27,000 per annum.)

Section 4(b) provides that there shall be in the Department an Assistant Secretary for Administration who would be appointed by the Secretary with the approval of the President. The Assistant Secretary would receive the same compensation as is provided by law for assistant secretaries for administration of executive departments ($26,000 per annum). He would perform the functions, powers, and duties prescribed by the Secretary.

TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT

Section 5(a) transfers to the Secretary all the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration, and the functions, powers, and duties of the heads and other officers and offices of those agencies.

Section 5(b) transfers the Federal National Mortgage Association, together with its functions, powers, and duties, to the Department. The Secretary of the Department would be vested with the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator with regard to FNMA. The Secretary would therefore become the Chairman of the Board of Directors of FNMA. FNMA would be an entity within the Department, and the rights and interests of the owners of outstanding common stock issued under the FNMA Charter Act would not be affected by the transfer.

Section 5(b) would also repeal language in section 308 of the FNMA Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1723), which was superseded by a subsequent provision in the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. Section 308 provided that the President of FNMA received compensation at the rate established for the heads of the constituents of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 listed the salary for the President of FNMA separately. Under the provisions of section 5(b) of the bill the separate listing in the Salary Act would be repealed, and the President of FNMA would be one of the six positions provided in section 7(c) of the bill with compensation at the annual rate applicable to level V of the Federal executive salary schedule provided by the Executive Salary Act of 1964 ($26,000).

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Section 6(a) would amend section 19(d)(1) of title 3 of the United States Code to place both the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in the line of succession to the office of the President of the United States. They would be eligible to act as President only if the Vice President, Speaker of the House, President pro tempore of the Senate, and the heads of other executive departments having precedence over them by law are unable to serve as President.

Sections 6(b) and 6(c) are technical provisions which would extend to the new Department the provisions of title IV of the

Revised Statutes, except to the extent inconsistent with the bill. Those provisions deal with such matters as departmental vacancies, regulations, duties of clerks, details and employment of personnel, oaths, subpenas, and witness fees.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 7(a) provides that all the personnel, liabilities, and resources, including funds, property, and records available in connection with the functions transferred by section 5 to the Department, are transferred with the respective functions.

Section 7(b) provides that no transfers of functions may be made within the Department with respect to the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association unless the Secretary finds such transfers would not adversely affect the rights and interests of the owners of FNMA common stock.

Section 7(c) would authorize the Secretary to appoint and fix the compensation of Department personnel and prescribe their duties. The law applicable to the Federal civil service would apply to employees of the Department. The Secretary further would be authorized to fix the compensation for not more than six positions at the annual rate applicable to positions in level V of the Federal executive salary schedule provided by the 1964 Executive Salary Act ($26,000).

Section 7(d) permits the Secretary to delegate any of his functions to such officers and employees of the Department as he may designate and to authorize successive redelegations of functions he has delegated. The Secretary is also authorized to prescribe necessary rules and regulations. This subsection repeals a portion of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), so that the Secretary could delegate or redelegate authority to (1) approve the workable program of a locality for dealing with its overall problems of slum and blight, (2) certify that Federal assistance to urban renewal work enumerated under section 101(c) may be made available to a community, and (3) determine that the relocation requirements of section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 have been met.

Section 7(e) authorizes the Secretary to obtain the services of experts and consultants at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals.

Section 7(f) authorizes the Secretary to establish a working capital fund, similar to those in other departments, for operating various common administrative services in the Department such as supply, messenger, mail, [redacted], space, library, and reproduction services. The revolving fund would be financed through appropriations, and charges against the agencies and offices in the Department for which services are performed.

Section 7(g) directs the Secretary to have a Department seal made and provides for judicial notice of the seal.

ANNUAL REPORT

Section 8 requires the Secretary to make an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress on the activities of the Department during the preceding calendar year.

SAVINGS PROVISIONS

Section 9(a) would provide that no cause of action by or against any agency or officer whose functions are transferred by the bill would abate by reason of the new act, and that such causes of action could be asserted by or against the United States or any appropriate official of the new Department.

Section 9(b) provides that any pending litigation or other proceeding by or against any agency or officer whose functions are transferred by the bill would not abate by reason of the new act, and also provides for appropriate substitution of successor parties.

Section 9(c) provides that, except as expressly provided in the bill, all powers and authorities otherwise existing would not be affected by the bill. All rules, regulations, and orders issued under applicable law prior to the effective date of the bill would continue in effect unless modified or rescinded by the Secretary or other legally authorized officer or office of the Department. References in other Federal laws to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or to any officers, office, or agency therein, except the FNMA and its officers, would be deemed to mean the Secretary. This subsection also provides that the positions and agencies (HHFA, FHA, and PHA, and their heads and officers) transferred under section 5(a) of the bill would lapse.

SEPARABILITY

Section 10 provides a standard separability clause.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND INTERIM APPOINTMENTS

Section 11(a) provides that the act would take effect 60 days from the date of its approval, or on such earlier date as the President may specify. However, in the interim, and any time after approval of the act, the President could nominate and the Senate could confirm the Department's officers. The Assistant Secretary for Administration could also be appointed during the interim period by the Secretary with the approval of the President. Such officers would not enter on duty until the act takes effect generally.

Section 11(b) makes provision for designation by the President of interim officers, as may be necessary, for a 60-day period immediately after the effective date of the act.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION RELATED TO THE PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OR COMMISSION TO DEAL WITH PROBLEMS OF URBAN AREAS

(By James R. King, economic analyst in Regional Development and Housing, Economics Division, February 26, 1965)

INTRODUCTION

It has long been recognized that the growth of urban areas in the United States has presented a major problem at local, State and National levels. Prior to the turn of the century less than one-half the population lived in urban areas; today 70 percent are classified as urban.

Moreover, there are now 50 urban places in the United States with a population of more than 250,000 each as compared to 15 in 1900. These 50 urban places house 40 million people rather than the 11 million that resided in cities of this size in 1900.

Towns with populations of between 25,000 and 50,000 at the turn of the century numbered only 82 and supported only 2.8 million citizens; today 14.8 million Americans live in 429 places of this size.

Small places of 2,500 to 5,000 have increased from 832 in 1900 to 2,140 in 1960 and presently account for a population of 7.5 million as compared to 2.9 million at the beginning of this century.

Urbanization has spared no size community its thrust. All have suffered under the strain of an increasing need for public facilities to accommodate the influx of population, usually in the face of a seeming inability on the part of local governments to provide a broad enough tax base to support such an increase.

State governments, it is charged, have shown little interest in assisting local communities in their effort to provide public improvements in their jurisdictions. Therefore, the Federal Government has been petitioned to play an increasing role in the provision of funds and services to local communities.

These developments have led, since 1954, to a growing interest on the part of some Members of Congress and other interest groups and individuals in the establishment of some type of executive department, office, or commission to deal specifically with problems of urban areas.

This report constitutes a chronological outline of the legislation, hearings and Presidential messages that have gone to make up the body of congressional activity concerning this concept. Two appendixes have been included at the end of the discussion: (1) A complete list of all bills related to the creation of a department, office, or commission on urban affairs, and (2) a brief bibliography including all references cited in this report.

This report is based in part on three prior Legislative Reference Service reports: Hilda M. James, "History of Congressional and Related Activities Concerned With the Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, 1961"; Erin M. Woodall, "A Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing: Summary and Selected Statements Pro and Con, 1962"; and Richard S. Greene, "Legislation Proposing a Department of Urban Affairs, 1963."

EVENTS PRIOR TO 1954

Connery and Leach, in their 1960 publication, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas," indicate that interest in creating a Department of Municipalities dates back to at least 1912. In that year Philip Kates suggested such a Department as primarily a study group to investigate all aspects of urban living and make their findings available to local authorities.

Kates' proposal, which appeared in American City,[1] interested Woodrow Wilson who replied in a letter printed in the same publication to the effect that he would like to discuss the proposal with Kates.

Nothing developed, however, and Connery and Leach cite a 1919 proposal by Harlean James for a Department of Civic Economy as the next major effort to create a Department to deal with urban affairs. As with the Kates' idea, James' Department would primarily conduct studies and experiments making its findings available to city and hamlet alike.

James' proposal suffered the same fate as that of Kates. The New Deal era brought the next significant development with the advocacy of a "voice for the cities" by Charles E. Merriam of the National Resources Board in 1934. Merriam, at that time, did not spell out his proposal as to form, but by 1942 he was committed to a separate administrative agency in Washington to care for the interests of the growing urban population.

After the end of the war, according to Connery and Leach (p. 168), Nathaniel S. Keith proposed in an unpublished manuscript, a Department of Community Development which in his words would "give the needed structure to the Federal interest in this field and provide Cabinet-level policy coordination for all Federal activities with an impact on community developmental problems."

Although further research might uncover other examples, and perhaps some variation in proposals, the analysis by Connery and Leach serves to point up the trend in thought. Apparently the increase in Federal aid to local communities has shifted the emphasis on the need for a department from a study or information agency, as suggested by Kates and James, to a body representing the urban population, as suggested by Merriam, and finally to Keith's proposal which emphasized coordination of Federal activities.

At the same time, the various proposals that have been submitted to Congress since 1954 usually reflect some combination of all

---

[1] Philip Kates, "A National Department of Municipalities, American City," January 1912, p. 405–407.

three concepts. The need for continued study of urban problems, representation of the growing urban population, and coordination of Federal assistance to local communities are included, with varying degrees of emphasis, in most arguments for creation of an arm of the President to deal with urban problems.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION 1954–61

Beginning with the 83d Congress, proposals for the establishment of a Department of Urbiculture or a Department of Urban Affairs have been submitted to each Congress. As already noted, the major purposes of these proposals have been (1) to study urban problems and make the information obtained available to local communities, (2) to give the urban population representation at the Cabinet level equal to that offered the rural population by the Department of Agriculture, and (3) to achieve some degree of coordination in Federal activities and programs related to urban affairs.

Mr. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, a Representative from California, introduced the first proposal for the establishment of a Department of Urbiculture in 1954 (H.R. 100032, 83d Cong.). No action was taken on this bill. During 1955, however, hearings were held by the House Committee on Government Operations on a similar bill submitted by Representative YOUNGER (H.R. 1864, 84th Cong.).

H.R. 1864 was primarily educational in purpose and sought as its analogy the work of the county agent of the Department of Agriculture. The purpose of the act was stated as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Congress finds that many of the most pressing problems facing the people of the United States grow out of the lack of knowledge and understanding of proper techniques in utilization of urban land; and that there is a corresponding national interest in the development of the science of urbiculture. Recognizing the invaluable contribution made by the Department of Agriculture in promoting increasingly efficient use of farmlands, the Congress enacts this act in order to provide a corresponding executive department to develop methods of dealing with pressing social, economic, and civic problems growing out of inadequate knowledge of the principles of using and developing urban lands, and to make these methods available to the people of the United States through suitable educational programs." [2]

The act would have created a Secretary of Urbiculture and transferred to him the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner. In addition, the act would have transferred the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and the National Housing Council to the new department.[3]

The hearings attracted little interest with only seven witnesses, including Representative YOUNGER, appearing to testify. Letters were received from five other sources.

Acceptance of the concept of a Department of Urbiculture was uniform throughout the hearings, but, friendly criticism developed over the scope of the proposal.

Albert B. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, testified that his agency, while receptive to the idea implicit in the bill was forced to oppose its passage because of the lack of clarification as to what areas of Federal activity the proposed Department would actually cover. Mr. Cole said: "So, what I am saying is this: We really are in favor of this committee examining this program. We think it is very important. Frankly, we look with favor upon the idea if the Congress and the executive branch can develop a plan which would be acceptable. We think it is growing in importance to such an extent that we can no longer ignore the need for the Federal Government to bring together in a coordinated program all of the programs which the Federal Government has upon urban living. Therefore, while we do not approve the enactment of this present bill, we are highly complimentary and very much interested in this approach, and would like to work with you to develop ideas which I have just barely touched upon this morning—a 'bare bones' approach, so to speak." [4]

Testimony from Percy Rappaport, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, disclosed an attitude similar to that of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Mr. Rappaport stated that, although his Bureau opposed the Younger bill:

"In taking such a position, the Bureau is in no sense opposed to the general objectives of the bill as we understand them. From my reading of the bill, it is my impression that the purpose is to create an executive department of the Government which, with respect to those people who live in cities and towns, would have the same enormously helpful role that the Department of Agriculture has had in relation to the farmers of this Nation.

"In drawing such a parallel, however, as the bill does in section 2, the result is to prescribe a role for the proposed Department of Urbiculture which would be far too limited and restricted. Section 2 provides only for a department which would undertake research in the development of methods for dealing with urban land problems and which could make these methods available to the people only through suitable educational programs.

"In contrast, the Housing and Home Finance Agency—whose functions would be transferred to the new department—is already engaged in action programs of a wide variety and scope. These programs affect the home-finance institutions, the home-building industry, the States and the cities and the individual renter or home purchaser. In other words, the present activities of the Government, which under the provisions of section 4(b) of the proposed bill would be transferred to the new department, have already gone far beyond the types of programs outlined in section 2 of the bill.

"It is for these reasons that the Bureau of the Budget believes that H.R. 1864 does not provide a suitable basis for considering the establishment of an 11th executive department." [5]

Both Cole and Rappaport, in answer to direct questions, stated that they felt the bill to be too restrictive.[6]

Representatives of the National Housing Conference, American Institute of Planners, American Municipal Association, and the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials either gave testimony or sent letters in support of H.R. 1864. Each indicated that its support was primarily for the concept of creating a Department to deal with urban problems and little testimony dealing specifically with the Younger bill was given by these associations. All made some reference to expanding the scope of the proposal but there was no clear consensus as to what the scope should be.

H.R. 1864 was not reported, but it did represent the beginning of a long line of legislative proposals of a similar nature which extends to the present time.

During the 2d session of the 84th Congress, two bills were introduced proposing the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs (S. 3159, Mr. Lehman; and H.R. 10295, Mr. Davidson). These bills died in the Committee on Government Operations.

The same fate was sustained by H.R. 1019, introduced by Mr. YOUNGER during the 1st session of the 85th Congress and S. 2159, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and others), during the same session. No proposals for a Federal Department were made during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, but Mr. Ostertag introduced a bill proposing a temporary commission on metropolitan problems.

Hearings were again held in 1959 when 11 bills were introduced to establish some kind of executive body responsible for the development and coordination of urban programs. H.R. 781 (GRIFFITHS); H.R. 2423 (Rains); and H.R. 4481 (Addonizio) sought to establish a Department of Urban Affairs. Representative YOUNGER continued to propose a Department of Urbiculture (H.R. 984) and gained the support of Senator Keating (S. 2397), and Representative BENNETT of Florida (H.R. 9259), for this approach.

Representative Ostertag again introduced a bill to create a Commission on Metropolitan Problems (H.R. 2416). This time four other measures were introduced to the same effect: S. 1431 (CLARK); H.R. 7282 (Bentley); H.R. 7378 (Granahan); and H.R. 7465 (FASCELL).

All House bills were given a hearing before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, June and July of 1959, with the exception of H.R. 9259 which was introduced after the hearings were held. Interest centered primarily on the creation of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and H.R. 7465 (FASCELL) was favorably reported with amendments August 18, 1959.

The two Senate bills received a hearing by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate and the Clark proposal (S. 1431) to create a Commission on Metropolitan Problems was reported September 2, 1959. As in the House, attention during the Senate hearings was primarily directed at the Commission proposal with the Department concept receiving less attention.

Although the House and Senate version of the bill to create a new Commission on Metropolitan Problems differed in several structural aspects, the basic purpose and function of the proposed Commission was the same in each. The following excerpts from the Senate and House Reports respectively point out some of the similarities and differences:

"PURPOSE

"S. 1431, introduced by Senator CLARK, would establish a temporary bipartisan Commission composed of 18 members to make a 'full and complete investigation and study of Federal policies and programs relating to the needs and problems of the Nation's metropolitan areas' for the purpose of determining—

"1. The present and prospective needs of the Nation's metropolitan areas;

"2. The capabilities of the different levels of government to meet such needs;

"3. The extent to which the Federal Government is assisting metropolitan areas in meeting such needs;

"4. Means for improving the coordination of Federal, State, and local policies and programs.

"Six members of the Commission would be appointed by the President of the Senate from the Senate, six would be appointed by the Speaker of the House from the House of Representatives (four from the majority and two from the minority in each case), and six would be appointed by the President of the United States, including the heads of two agencies of the executive branch, two Governors (one from each party), and two

[2] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Creation of a Department of Urbiculture," hearings, 84th Cong., 1st sess., p. 1.

[3] Ibid. p. 2.

[4] Ibid. p. 21.

[5] Ibid. p. 25.

[6] Ibid. p. 22, 25.

mayors (one from each party). The Commission would submit its final report, including recommendations, to the President and to the Congress on or before February 1, 1961, and cease to exist 6 months after submission of its report.'

"PURPOSE

"The purpose of H.R. 7465, as amended, is to establish a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development which shall study and investigate the problems of municipalities and metropolitan expansion, with special reference to the need, in terms of adequate governmental structures, to establish sound revenue policies as related to State and National revenue policies, and to determine the services which such governmental structures should provide.

"It shall also study existing and developing efforts to cope with municipal and metropolitan problems including Federal policies and programs and any need for improved coordination thereof. It shall formulate findings and recommendations 'as to necessary and desirable steps to be initiated at the National, State, and local levels, to insure sound and orderly metropolitan growth within the framework of our traditional patterns of responsibility and control.' The Commission will be composed of 15 members to be appointed by the President and shall submit its findings and recommendations to the President for transmittal to Congress within 18 months. The Commission will be authorized to hold hearings, will be given the power of subpena, and may request information from departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government." [8]

The House did not act on H.R. 7465, but the Senate passed S. 1431 with amendments on September 10, 1959. No action was taken in the House, however, and the measure died.

During this same period of time a related bill was being considered by Congress. In its minority views on H.R. 7465, several members of the House Committee on Government Operations had expressed the opinion that the urban problems being considered were intergovernmental in nature and should fall under the administration of the proposed Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which would be set up by H.R. 6904. This bill had been reported favorably by the House Committee on Government Operations, and was passed by the House on August 17, 1959.

The minority reasoned that—

"If the undersigned have misinterpreted the purport of H.R. 7465 and if the problems of municipalities and metropolitan expansion contemplated here are intragovernmental rather than intergovernmental, then the bill would have the Federal Government intrude in areas of local and State jurisdiction and encourage further dependence on the Central Government.

"The undersigned are basically opposed to expansion of Federal authority and activities, especially with reference to those functions which should and can be performed by the States and municipalities. But we believe the Federal Government can and should be of assistance from the perspective of its proper role in Federal-local relationships. For that reason, we favored H.R. 6904 and believe Federal advice and assistance can and should be provided with respect to metropolitan problems through the Commission that bill creates.

"Creating two commissions simultaneously, with duplicating and overlapping functions, will not only be costly and confusing but may well lead either to divergent views and incompatible conclusions or to delay and inactivity because of the necessity of coordination and consultation to avoid conflict.

"In any event, the undersigned cannot espouse both a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations as contemplated by H.R. 6904 and a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development as contemplated by H.R. 7465.

"CLARE E. HOFFMAN.
"R. WALTER RIEHLMAN.
"GEORGE MEADER.
"CLARENCE J. BROWN.
"FLORENCE P. DWYER.
"JOE HOLT.
"ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.
"GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER.
"JESSICA MCC. WEIS.
"ODIN LANGEN.
"ROBERT R. BARRY." [9]

H.R. 6904 fared better than either the House or Senate measure to create a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and after joint committee hearings was reported (July 31, 1959), went to conference, and was signed as Public Law 380 on September 24, 1959. The creation of a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations evidently put a damper on subsequent initiative for this approach to metropolitan problems. A Commission on Metropolitan Problems has not been legislatively proposed since 1959. On the other hand either a department or office has been proposed in every subsequent session.

During the 2d session of the 86th Congress, three bills H.R. 11918 (LINDSAY); H.R. 12508 (HALPERN); and H.R. 13024 (Santangelo) were introduced in suport of a Department of Urban Affairs, but no action followed. Another measure, S. 3292 (CLARK and others) would have established a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs. This bill was referred t. the Senate Banking and Currency Committee where hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Housing as part of its regular hearings on housing legislation in 1960. Moreover, S. 3292 was reported favorably by the committee on June 16, 1960.

In commenting on the growing support for such a department, the committee noted that: "Twenty-two years ago, the President's Committee on Administrative Management called attention to the needs of urban communities and urged the Bureau of the Budget to assume future responsibilities in this area. In 1942, Charles E. Merriam called for a Department of Urbanism within the Federal Government during a conference on this subject at Harvard University. Eight years ago, the National Housing Conference recommended to Congress the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development. In subsequent years, this recommendation has been supported by the American Municipal Association, representing more than 12,000 cities in the United States, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, representing more than 315 cities in the United States, the AFL–CIO, the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials, and the Society of Planning Officials." [10]

Opposition to such a department, however, was also evident in the 1960 hearings.

Both the Bureau of the Budget and the Housing and Home Finance Agency submitted opinions opposing S. 3292. The Bureau of the Budget objected on grounds that the newly created Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and other previously existing Federal agencies were already engaged in the study of metropolitan problems and coordination of Federal programs to assist urban areas. In addition, the Bureau objected to the lack of specified functions that the new Department would perform.[11]

The Housing and Home Finance Agency, on the other hand, concurred in the idea that a department should be established but opposed S. 3292 on other grounds. The Administrator, in a letter to the committee chairman stated as follows: "The objections, which I see in S. 3292, relate only to the timing and the method of approach." [12] The Administrator felt that the subject of creating a new department was a long-term proposition which could be dealt with at any time. Furthermore, he insisted that the proper method of creating a new department was by Presidential reorganization as authorized under the Reorganization Act of 1949.[13]

Opposition to the proposed Department was also recorded in the statements of the National Association of Real Estate Boards,[14] and the United States Chamber of Commerce.[15] Both organizations felt that the creation of such a department would tend to institutionalize Federal aid to local communities.

S. 3292 was passed over on June 18, 1960, and June 28, 1960, and died on the calendar.

The period 1954–61 was thus one of evolution from the original introduction of the concept of a Department of Urbiculture to study metropolitan problems to the more specific function of coordination of Federal assistance programs implicit in S. 3292. The study function, although still considered to be very much a part of the function of the proposed Department, was, at least temporarily, sidetracked by the creation of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in 1959.

By the beginning of 1961, hearings on the subject of metropolitan problems had been held twice in the Senate (1959 and 1960), and twice in the House (1954 and 1959). No bill was reported out of the 1954 hearings, but the 1959 hearings produced two favorably reported measures (H.R. 7465 and S. 1431) to create a Commission on Metropolitan Problems, and following the 1960 hearings, the Senate committee reported favorably on a bill to create a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs (S. 3292). None, however, were acted on in both Houses and only S. 1431 came to a vote in either House.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION, 1961–62

On January 30, 1961, the administration started an intensive campaign for a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs that carried over into 1962. In his state of the Union address on that day, President Kennedy said: "Our national household is cluttered with unfinished and neglected tasks. Our cities are being engulfed in squalor. Twelve long years after Congress declared our goal to be a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family, we still have 25 million Americans living in substandard homes. A new housing program under a new Housing and Urban Affairs Department will be needed this year."

On March 9, 1961, President Kennedy again called for such a department. In his housing message of that date the President said:

"Urban and suburban areas now contain the overwhelming majority of our population, and a preponderance of our industrial,

[7] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, "Providing for the Establishment of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems," S. Rept. 881, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 1.

[8] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Establishing a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development," H. Rept. 940, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 4

[9] Ibid., p. 21, 22.

[10] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, "Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs," S. Rept. 1607, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5.

[11] U.S. Congress, Housing legislation of 1960, hearings, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 73.

[12] Ibid., p. 70.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid., p. 328.

[15] Ibid., p. 1029.

commercial, and educational resources. The programs outlined above, as well as existing housing and community development programs, deserve the best possible administrative efficiency, stature, and role in the councils of the Federal Government. An awareness of these problems and programs should be constantly brought to the Cabinet table, and coordinated leadership provided for functions related to urban affairs but appropriately performed by a variety of departments and agencies.

"I therefore recommend—and shall shortly offer a suggested proposal for—the establishment in the executive branch of a new, Cabinet-rank Department of Housing and Urban Affairs."

This request was formalized on April 18, 1961, when President Kennedy sent Congress draft legislation to carry out his recommendations. H.R. 6433 (FASCELL), and S. 1633 (CLARK) were introduced as the administration bills.

By this time, however, 13 other Members had introduced similar bills and 2 more bills were introduced on April 20. This made a total of 17 measures to create some kind of Department of Urban Affairs, Department of Urbiculture, or Department of Urban Affairs and Housing introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

Though differing in title, all the bills introduced in the 1st session sought to establish a Cabinet-level department to deal with the problems of urban areas.

Hearings were held on H.R. 6433 in late May and early June of 1961 by a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the House,[16] and S. 1633, along with S. 289 (Keating), S. 375 (HARTKE), S. 609 (Bush), were considered in late June of the same year by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate.[17]

Although differing materially in their wording and content, all four bills considered in the Senate and the one House measure taken up, had in common the creation of a new department headed by a Secretary, and all bills visualized the Housing and Home Finance Agency as the nucleus of the new Department, with the possible exception of the Keating proposal, which left the transfer of existing agencies entirely to the discretion of the President.

In varying degrees of emphasis, all five bills listed the functions of the new Department as the study of housing and development problems, policy recommendation to the President, technical assistance, and coordination of Federal activities.

During the hearings many former friends of the proposed Department joined new friends in advocating its creation.

Leading organizations supporting the proposals for a new Department of Urban Affairs in 1961 included: The American Municipal Association; the U.S. Conference of Mayors; Americans for Democratic Action; American Institute of Planners; American Veterans' Committee; National Housing Conference; National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials; AFL–CIO; National Urban League; American Institute of Architects; Florida League of Municipalities; Alabama League of Municipalities; National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

The basic premise of the proposals for the establishment of this Department was to coordinate and expedite planning and activity under the existing Housing and Home Finance Agency which now cover a wide range of diverse but closely interrelated activities. These programs include among others: insurance of mortgages and loans on new and existing housing; financial assistance for low-income housing; financial aids to communities for comprehensive local planning, slum clearance, and renewal of urban areas; advances and loans for the planning and construction of needed public facilities; loans to meet increasing needs for college and university housing; and financial aid for critical mass transportation problems in urban areas. The proponents of the new Department argued that it would help pool our national resources for urban research, planning, and programs and thereby facilitate the solution of vital urban problems. The advocates of the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing also asserted that the increase in the size, scope, complexity, and national significance of urban problems which accompanied the transformation of our Nation from a rural society to a predominantly urban one warrants the creation of a Federal Department of equal rank with the Department of Agriculture, which deals primarily with rural problems.

Along with both new and old friends, testimony was heard by several old and new opponents to the creation of a new Cabinet level department to deal with urban problems.

Those opposed to an Urban Affairs and Housing Department expressed the view that the creation of such an executive department presupposed a permanent and expanding Federal role in housing and urban renewal and gives the status which distorts the proper role of the Federal Government in this area. In their opinion, addition of another Federal department would tend to undermine historic Federal, State, and local relationships by opening up a direct avenue of approach for the extension of Federal financial assistance to municipal officials which will bypass the States.

The opponents also pointed out that the new Department could not achieve its stated goal of coordinating all Federal activities in the field of housing and urban affairs since the proposed Department would not include the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the housing program of the Veterans' Administration, which together account for over half of the financial support of private housing in the United States.

Statements in opposition to the proposals for a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs also pointed out that many of the pressing problems of urban areas, such as airport and highway construction, are not peculiar to urban areas, making it impossible to coordinate all the Federal activities related to urban areas in a Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Major organized opposition to a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing came from the following organizations: The National Association of Real Estate Boards; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; The National Association of Manufacturers; The National Association of County Officials; Council of State Governments; The American Farm Bureau Federation; The National Association of Home Builders.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency did not testify at either the House or Senate hearings, but David E. Bell, then Director of the Bureau of the Budget, appeared at both hearings in favor of the new Department.

During the House hearings Bell stated the position of the Bureau of the Budget as follows: "Thus, an executive Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is clearly needed, first, to provide the most effective administrative framework for strengthening coordination and providing effective leadership in urban development, and, second, to recognize the growing significance, magnitude, and permanence of current programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency." [18]

Bell also emphasized that the new Department would consider the problems of small towns as well as large metropolitan areas. In response to a question regarding the large portion of his testimony devoted to small areas, Bell indicated that "in our judgment the smaller areas have a most important stake, essentially a larger stake than the bigger areas, in the passage of a bill of this kind." [19]

On August 28, 1961, the House reported a clean bill (H.R. 8429),[20] and on September 6 the Senate reported an amended version of S. 1633 [21] identical to the clean bill reported in this House a few days before.

As reported, the two measures differed from the draft legislation sent to Congress by President Kennedy in two respects: (1) the FHA retained its independent status within the new Department and was not dissolved as originally requested, and (2) a language change was made to define an urban area as a city or township of any size, incorporated or unincorporated, thus insuring that the jurisdiction of the new Department would extend to small as well as large areas.

Minority reports were filed in both Houses with opposition centering on the suspended direct relationship that the Federal Government and large metropolitan areas were trying to establish on a permanent basis, largely bypassing State governments.

In commenting on S. 1663, the Senate minority stated that: "Enactment of this legislation will not encourage the initiative of States or of cities, but will violate the principles of the Federal system, usurp authority vested in State governments, crumble the walls of self-determination, demolish local leadership, and build ever higher the stronghold of Central Government." [22]

On the House side, the minority report on H.R. 8429 stated the position that:

"If the State and local governments are to be done away with as vestigial remnants of an outmoded system, let it be stated clearly so that those concerned are aware of the real issue and not deluded with the housing camouflage. There is more involved here than conferring Cabinet status on the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The preservation of our Federal system of government is involved." [23]

Additional minority opposition was based, among other things, on the unnecessary proliferation of departments of Cabinet rank, the lack of small town support, and the lack of administrative necessity since no new programs were proposed.

Neither the House bill or the Senate bill reached the floor in 1961. Both measures were carried over into the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

On January 24, 1962, the House Rules Committee refused to grant a rule for floor action on H.R. 8429. Six days later President Kennedy submitted to Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, creating a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs

---

[16] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Department of Urban Affairs and Housing," hearings, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[17] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, "Establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing," hearings, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[18] Ibid., p. 37.

[19] Ibid., p. 51–52.

[20] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Other Purposes," H. Rept. 1053, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[21] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, "The Department of Urban Affairs," S. Rept. 879, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[22] Ibid., p. 25.

[23] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Other Purposes," H. Rept. 1053, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

and Housing.[24] The plan was submitted under the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1949, which authorized the President to submit to Congress plans to reorganize Government agencies through transfer, abolition or consolidation of agency functions.

Reorganization plans under the 1949 act take effect automatically within 60 days unless disapproved by a simple majority vote in either House and are not subject to amendment.

On the same day that the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 was transmitted to Congress, House Resolution 530 (Meader) was introduced in the House and on January 31, S. Res. 288 (McGee) was introduced in the Senate. Both resolutions disapproved the plan.

The House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, February 6–8 and the Senate Committee on Government Operations held hearings February 14–16. Major witnesses for and against the plan were virtually the same as those appearing before the respective House and Senate committees during the 1961 hearings. No major witness expressed a change of position from that taken the year before. Thus, arguments for and against the proposed Department also ran much the same as those of 1961.

On February 15, 1962, one week after the close of its hearings, the House Committee on Government Operations reported House Resolution 530 unfavorably, which meant that the majority of the committee favored the President's plan rather than the resolution of disapproval.

A minority report was filed opposing the plan (favoring H. Res. 530) on the grounds that "Reorganization Plan No. 1 is premature, unnecessary, will not accomplish what its proponents represent, and is contrary to sound principles of governmental organizations." [25]

It was announced that House Resolution 530 would be considered in the House on February 21. This prompted the Senate leadership to ask for a discharge petition on Senate Resolution 288 which had not been reported in the Senate. On February 20, a motion to discharge the Senate Government Operations Committee from further consideration of Senate Resolution 288 was defeated on a 58 to 42 rollcall vote.

As anticipated, the House took up House Resolution 530 on February 21 and adopted it by a 264 to 150 rollcall vote. This vote put an end to consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 1 in the 87th Congress.

While the major activity in the second session of the 87th Congress centered on the President's reorganization proposal, individual Members continued to introduce legislation to effect a change in the Federal structure for dealing with metropolitan or urban problems.

Seven bills were introduced in 1962: five would have created an [redacted]ce of Urban Affairs, one an [redacted]ce of State and Urban Affairs, and one a Department of Federal-State-Urban Affairs. No action was taken on any of these proposals, but the idea of an office as opposed to a department represented a new approach, as did the proposal for a Department of Federal-State-Urban Affairs.

The proposed Office of Urban Affairs or Office of State and Urban Affairs would study urban problems, advise the President, and be responsible for the coordination of Federal assistance programs.

The proposal for a Department of Federal-State-Urban Affairs in addition to placing formal consideration of the traditional intergovernmental relations both in its title and its statement of purpose, would transfer all functions of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to the new Department. Other transfers to the new Department are the ones included in former Department of Urban Affairs bills.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY SINCE 1962

President Kennedy made no mention of the Department of Urban Affairs in his state of the Union message at the outset of the 88th Congress in January 1963. No draft legislation was submitted, nor were any bills introduced in the name of the administration. The need for a new department was mentioned, however, in the President's budget message of January 17, 1963.

Lack of executive initiative did not prevent continued congressional interest in such a department from being expressed by individual Members, however.

Eight House bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 88th Congress: five for a Department of Urban Affairs, one for a Department of Urbiculture, one for an Office of State and Urban Affairs, and one for an Office of Community Affairs. No Senate measures were offered, and no hearings were held in the House.

President Johnson did not mention a new Cabinet post in his 1964 state of the Union message, but in his housing message of January 23, 1964, he included the following comments:

"If we are to deal successfully with the complex problems of our urban and suburban communities, we need governmental machinery designed for the 1960's, not the 1940's. The Housing and Home Finance Agency, established 17 years ago primarily to administer housing programs, has seen its responsibilities enlarged progressively by the Congress during the intervening years to include the broader aspects of community development as well. The Agency now administers such major community development programs as urban renewal, urban planning, public facilities planning and loans, open space, and mass transit. These basic changes in the Agency's role and mission are not adequately reflected in the Agency's current organization and status which remain much the same as they were in 1947. Action to convert the Housing and Home Finance Agency into an executive department is long overdue.

"The size and breadth of the Federal programs now administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the significance of those programs clearly merit departmental status. A new Secretary of Housing and Community Development would be in a position both to present effectively the Nation's housing and community development needs in the highest councils of Government and to direct, organize, and manage more efficiently the important and closely interrelated housing and community development programs now administered or proposed for the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

"I recommend that the Congress establish a Department of Housing and Community Development." [26]

Two days later S. 2475 [Clark] was introduced to carry out the President's request. On February 13, an identical bill, H.R. 9983 [Reuss], was introduced in the House. No further action was taken on these bills, but the concept of a Department of Housing and Community Development did receive some comment in the hearings on the Housing Act of 1964 held by Banking and Currency Subcommittees in both Houses during February and March, 1964.[27]

Thus far in 1965 President Johnson has placed great emphasis on the administration's intention to create a new Cabinet-level department. In his state of the Union message of January 4, the President cited his plans for the American city:

"An educated and healthy people require surroundings in harmony with their hopes.

"In our urban areas the central problem today is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community where he can find security and significance.

"The first step is to break old patterns—to begin to think, work, and plan for the development of entire metropolitan areas. We will take this step with new programs of help for basic community facilities and neighborhood centers of health and recreation.

"New and existing programs will be open to those cities which work together to develop unified long-range policies for metropolitan areas.

"We must also make important changes in our housing programs if we are to pursue these same basic goals.

"A Department of Housing and Urban Development will be needed to spearhead this effort in our cities." [28]

The President again mentioned the need for such a department in his budget message on January 25, and has promised to send draft legislation to Congress in the near future.

SUMMARY

There is no question that the problems of the urban areas in the United States are great and growing. There is also no question that the Federal Government has a responsibility to assist municipalities that seek its help. Past this broad ground of agreement there is little consensus as to what should be done or how it should be done.

As indicated in this report, Congress has been at work since 1953 attempting to define the proper procedure and scope of Federal activity in the area of urban affairs. It is no simple problem.

Difficulties in establishing Federal policy regarding local community assistance stem largely from ambiguities inherent in recent Federal relations with municipal government, from the question of jurisdiction within the executive branch of the Federal Government, and from the appropriate functions to be performed.

First there is the changing relationship of the Federal Government to the local communities in the context of our Federal system of government. Traditionally, intercourse within the system has been between the several States and the Central Government in Washington. In the past few decades, cities and towns, as well as large metropolitan areas have looked more and more to the Central Government in Washington for financial assistance. This has strained the traditional federalism we have long accepted as proper, by establishing a direct relationship between the Central Government and local municipalities, which are actually creations of the several State governments.

The growth of the Federal grant-in-aid program has established a de facto relationship where no de jure relationship has existed. Large Federal expenditures in local communities have in many cases by-passed

---

[24] U.S. Congress, message from the President of the United States, "Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962."

[25] U.S. Congress, Committee on Government Operations, "Approving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962," H. Rept. 1360, 87th Cong., 2d sess., p. 39.

[26] U.S. Congress, message from the President of the United States, drafts of bills relating to housing, 1964.

[27] U.S. Congress, Committee on Banking and Currency, housing, and community development legislation, 1964. Hearings, 88th Cong., 2d sess.; also, U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, housing legislation, 1964. Hearings, 88th Cong., 2d sess.

[28] U.S. Congress, message of the President of the United States, state of the Union message, 1965, p. 8.

the State governments entirely, creating a new kind of federalism which tends to exclude the State as a functional unit. This change in the structure of American federalism has been a source of strong opposition to the institutionalization of the new relationship through the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs.

Second, there remain wide areas of divergence of views as to the place of the new department, agency, or commission in the executive branch of the Government, the potential of overlapping or conflicting jurisdictions, and the additional authority it would give the President.

Finally, within the ranks of those who support the idea of a Department of Urban Affairs in general, there is no well-defined statement as to what the scope of the new Department should be—either geographically, i.e., What is an urban area? or functionally, i.e., What Federal programs other than those of HHFA would be included later?

Federal activities in the area of local public works through the Area Redevelopment Administration and Accelerated Public Works programs raise additional questions as to whether these functions might not also be a part of the new Department. Both programs instituted since 1961 were not in existence at the time of last hearings on creating a new department.

It would be well to note that the functions of the Area Redevelopment Administration were at one point (See Douglas-Payne bill, S. 3683) scheduled to be administered by the HHFA, and that the Community Facilities Administration, a constituent unit of HHFA, presently administers all ARA and APW Public Facility loans and grants—approximately 30 and 50 percent of the programs of ARA and APW respectively.

Moreover, the recently enacted antipoverty program was not in existence at the time of the last hearing on the Department on Urban Affairs. This new program with its many aids for urban areas will have to be considered in relation to the creation of a new department.

Recent support by many Members of Congress for a regional approach to economic development adds still another dimension to the consideration of the new Department. No clear notion of what constitutes a region has yet appeared. If a region comes to mean a metropolitan area it must surely have a great deal to do with urban affairs, and, hence, may be a function of the new Department.

Therefore, regional functions, such as air and water pollution control, highway and airport development, and wildlife and recreational preservation can also be considered in connection with the proposed Department of Urban Affairs.

Conversely, there are those who oppose the creation of a new department precisely because it may become a broad-based Department of Urban Affairs rather than primarily a Department of Housing. The National Association of Home Builders and the National Association of Counties fall in this category.

Consideration of the hearings discussed in this report indicate that the evolution of the legislation introduced and considered by Congress shows a tendency to concentrate on the growing role of Federal grants-in-aid, with consideration shifting from primary study of urban problems to a coordination of Federal activities in urban areas.

The next round of hearings, which will probably be held during the 89th Congress will, no doubt, address the problems of scope, mentioned above, as well as the problems of federalism and grants-in-aid, which have been a part of the history of the development of the concept of a Department of Urban Affairs.

In closing, it appears fitting to record an exchange between several members of the House Committee on Government Operations and Congressman YOUNGER during the 1955 hearings on the creation of a Department of Urbiculture—the first hearings to be held on this subject:

"Mr. YOUNGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

"I want to express my personal appreciation to you and to the committee for scheduling a hearing on this bill. I want to state at the outset that I am not naive enough to believe that a bill of this character can be speedily passed in the Congress.

"Mr. BROWN. You mean you do not expect to have it enacted before we adjourn?

"Mr. YOUNGER. Not before we adjourn, Mr. BROWN.

"Mr. DAWSON. We will have the hearing and do it when we come back.

"Mr. YOUNGER. However, I am convinced that a bill of this type sometime will be passed, and a department as authorized by this bill will be created. It may be 8 or 10 years from now.

"Now, my only object is to start the counting of the time for the 8 or 10 years from now, rather than from 2 years from now or 4 years from now."

APPENDIX I

Legislation proposing a department, office, or commission to deal with urban problems: 1953–64

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS (ACT)

Bill No.	Sponsor	Congress	Date of introduction
H.R. 7731	Griffiths	84th	July 29, 1955
H.R. 3383	do	85th	Jan. 22, 1957
H.R. 5732	Rains	do	May 14, 1957
H.R. 781	Griffiths	86th	Jan. 7, 1959
R. 2423	Rains	do	Jan. 15, 1959
H.R. 4481	Addonizio	do	Feb. 16, 1959
R. 11918	Lindsay	do	Apr. 26, 1960
R. 12508	Halpern	do	June 2, 1960
R. 13024	Santangelo	do	Aug. 17, 1960
R. 301	Bennett of Florida.	87th	Jan. 3, 1961
H.R. 350	Fascell	do	Do.
H.R. 557	Rodino	do	Do.
H.R. 962	Griffiths	do	Do.
H.R. 964	Halpern	do	Do.
H.R. 2042	Lindsay	do	Jan. 6, 1961
S. 289	Keating	do	Jan. 10, 1961
S. 375	Hartke	do	Jan. 11, 1961
H.R. 2389	Addonizio	do	Jan. 12, 1961
H.R. 5346	Farbstein	do	Mar. 8, 1961
H.R. 6065	Ryan of New York.	do	Mar. 29, 1961
H.R. 1123	Rodino	88th	Jan. 9, 1963
H.R. 1640	Halpern	do	Jan. 10, 1963
H.R. 4067	Ryan of New York.	do	Feb. 21, 1963
H.R. 5955	Patten	do	Apr. 30, 1963
H.R. 8942	Lindsay	do	Oct. 28, 1963

DEPARTMENT OF URBICULTURE

H.R. 10032	Younger	83d	July 23, 1954
H.R. 1864	do	84th	Jan. 10, 1955
H.R. 1019	do	85th	Jan. 3, 1957
H.R. 984	do	86th	Jan. 7, 1959
S. 2397	Keating	do	July 16, 1959
H.R. 9259	Bennett of Florida.	do	Sept. 14, 1959
H.R. 1125	Younger	87th	Jan. 3, 1961
H.R. 434	do	88th	Jan. 9, 1963

DEPARTMENT OF FEDERAL-STATE-URBAN AFFAIRS

S. 2861	Boggs	87th	Feb. 19, 1962

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

H.R. 6433	Fascell	87th	Apr. 18, 1961
S. 1633	Clark, others	do	Do.
H.R. 6538	McDowell	do	Apr. 20, 1961
H.R. 6547	Toll	do	Do.
H.R. 8429	Fascell	do	Aug. 1, 1961

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

H.R. 9983	Reuss	88th	Feb. 13, 1964
S. 2475	Clark	do	Jan. 29, 1964

Legislation proposing a department, office, or commission to deal with urban problems: 1953–64—Continued

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS

Bill No.	Sponsor	Congress	Date of introduction
S. 3292	Clark, others	86th	Mar. 29, 1960

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

S. 3159	Lehman, others	84th	Feb. 8, 1956
H.R. 10295	Davidson	do	Mar. 29, 1956
S. 2159	Clark, others	85th	May 27, 1957
H.R. 12153	Rains	86th	May 10, 1960
H.R. 12161	Addonizio	do	May 11, 1960
S. 609	Bush	87th	Jan. 26, 1961

COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

H.R. 2416	Ostertag	86th	Jan. 15, 1959
S. 1431	Clark	do	Mar. 16, 1959
H.R. 7282	Bentley	do	May 20, 1959
H.R. 7378	Granahan	do	May 26, 1959
H.R. 7465	Fascell	do	June 1, 1959

OFFICE OF URBAN AFFAIRS

H.R. 10302	Dwyer	87th	Feb. 20, 1962
H.R. 10393	Schweiker	do	Feb. 26, 1962
H.R. 10445	Fulton	do	Feb. 27, 1962
H.R. 11674	Scranton	do	May 9, 1962
S. 3516	Scott	do	July 6, 1962

OFFICE OF STATE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

H.R. 10301	Barry	87th	Feb. 20, 1962
H.R. 5162	do	88th	Mar. 28, 1963

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

H.R. 7509	Schweiker	88th	July 11, 1963

APPENDIX II

PROPOSALS FOR A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS: A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS, ARTICLES, AND GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS [1]

I. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

"A Federal Department of Urban Affairs," Current Municipal Problems, August 1959: 1–7.

"Action Postponed on Urban Affairs Department," Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1961: 367–371.

BIBLE, ALAN, "Uncle Sam's Metro Job," National Civic Review, December 1960: 595–601.

"Cabinet Seat for the Cities," Business Week, November 26, 1960: 71–4.

"Cities Poised To Join Cabinet," Business Week, April 22, 1961: 129–30.

"City Desk in the Cabinet?" Senior Scholastic [pro-con], November 15, 1961: 12–13.

CLARK, JOSEPH S., "To Come to the Aid of Their Cities," New York Times magazine, April 30, 1961: 11.

"Congress Blocks Urban Affairs Plan," Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1962: 380–384.

"Congress Gets Urban Affairs Bill," Engineering News-Record, April 20, 1961: 23.

"Congress Kills Cabinet Seat for Cities," Architectural Forum, March 1962: 5.

Connery, Robert H., and Richard H. Leach, "Do We Need a Department of Urban Af-

[1] NOTE—This bibliography deals only with articles pertaining directly to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. In addition, publications of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations should be consulted along with other articles and books on metropolitan planning, intergovernmental relations, and Federal grants-in-aid.

fairs"? Western Political Quarterly, March 1960: 99–112.

———"The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas," Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1960 [especially ch. 5].

"Debacle," Newsweek, March 5, 1963: 24.

"Defeat of Urban Affairs Post Leaves Big Cities With Big Problems," Business Week, Mar. 3, 1962: 72.

"Do we need a Secretary for Urban Affairs?" [pro-con] Senior Scholastic, Oct. 11, 1963: 10–11.

"Forcing the Urban Issue," Economist, Feb. 24, 1962: 704.

Gelman, Norman I., "Metropolitan Areas and the Federal Government," Editorial Research Reports, Jan. 21, 1959: 41–58.

Graves, W. Brooke, "American Intergovernmental Relations," New York Scribners, 1964. [Especially pp. 677–694, 905–906, 916–918.]

Hacker, Andrew, "Voice of 90 Million Americans," New York Times magazine, Mar. 4, 1962: 11.

Hindman, Jo, "Who Are the Metrocrats?" American Mercury, June 1960: 71–78.

"How Washington Would Control Your City," Nations Business, October 1963: 94.

HUMPHREY, HUBERT H., "To Aid the Small City," National Civic Review, December 1961: 582–586.

Hutchinson, Theodore M., "Metropolitan Area Problems: The Role of the Federal Government," Ann Arbor, Mich., legal publications, legislative research center, University of Michigan Law School, 1961, 65 pages.

"Kennedy's Pitch for the City Vote," Business Week, Feb. 10, 1962: 32–33.

Lindsay, J. J., "Underprivileged Majority," Nation, Mar. 10, 1962: 208–210.

"Our Shame and Glory," America, Feb. 3, 1962: 579.

"Politics and Urban Needs," Commonweal, Mar. 9, 1962: 607.

"Proposal To Establish a New Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing," Congressional Digest, November 1961, [includes pro-con]: 257–288.

"Reorganization Act," Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1963: 392.

"Should Uncle Sam Be Your Mayor?" Nations Business, January 1961: 14.

"Should Your Cities Growth Depend on Washington," Nations Business, October 1961: 116.

"The National Government and Urban Affairs," Vital Issues. Center for information on America, Washington, Conn., vol. XII, No. 6, February 1963.

"Urban Affairs," New Republic, Feb. 5, 1962: 6.

"Urban Department," Senior Scholastic, Feb. 14, 1962: 21.

Urban Talk," Newsweek, Feb. 19, 1962: 22.

"Voice for the Cities?" Economist, Jan. 20, 1962: 227.

Wagner, Robert F., "Help for Our Cities," National Civic Review, January 1960: 6–10, 21.

"Washington Reaches for Your City Hall," Nations Business, November 1961: 34–35.

"We Do Need a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing," Better Homes and Gardens, November 1961: 86.

Wheaton, William L. C., "A New Cabinet Post?" National Civil Review, December 1959: 574–578.

YOUNGER, J. ARTHUR, "We Need a Department of Urban Affairs," This Week, Aug. 5, 1957: p. 8.

II. GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Hearings

U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Creation of a Department of Urbiculture." Hearings before a subcommittee, 84th Congress, 1st session on H.R. 1864. (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955, 52 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Department of Urban Affairs and Housing." Hearings before a subcommittee, 87th Congress, 1st session, on H.R. 6433. (May and June 1961, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961, 241 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development." Hearings before a subcommittee, 86th Congress, 1st session, June 3, 9, 19, and July 21, 1959. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959, 151 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962." Hearings before the Committee on Government Operations, 87th Congress, 2d session, February 1962. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, 285 p.)

U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency. "Housing Legislation of 1960." Hearings before a subcommittee, 86th Congress, 2d session on various bills to amend the Federal housing laws. (May 1960, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960. 1041 p.)

U.S. Congress, Committee on Government Operations, "Create a Commission on Metropolitan Problems." Hearing before the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, 86th Congress, 1st session on S. 1431 and S. 2397, July 24, 1959. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. 73 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing." Hearings before the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, 87th Congress, 1st session, on S. 1633, S. 289, S. 375, and S. 609, June 1961. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. 238 p.)

U.S. Congress, hearings before the Committee on Government Operations, 87th Congress, 2d session, on Senate Resolution 288, February 1962. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962. 313 p.)

U.S. Congress, "To Establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations." Joint hearings before the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations and the Senate Committee on Government Operations, 86th Congress, 1st session on H.R. 6904, H.R. 6905 and S. 2026, June 16, 17, 19, and 22, 1959. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. 206 p.)

REPORTS

U.S. Congress, House Committee on Government Operations. "Approving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962." (H. Rept. 1360, 87th Cong., 2d sess., on H. Res. 530.) February 15, 1962. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962. 47 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Establishing a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development." (H. Rept. 940, 86th Cong., 1st sess., on H.R. 7465.) August 18, 1959. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. 22 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, and for other purposes." (H. Rept. 1053, 87th Cong., 1st sess., on H.R. 8429.) August 28, 1961. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. 33 p.)

U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency. "Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs." (S. Rept. 1607, 86th Cong., 2d sess., on S. 3292.) June 16, 1960. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960. 12 p.)

U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Government Operations, "providing for the establishment of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems." (S. Rept. 881, 86th Cong., 1st sess., on S. 1431.) September 2, 1959. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. 21 p.)

U.S. Congress, "The Department of Urban Affairs and Housing." (S. Rept. 879, 87th Cong., 1st sess., on S. 1633.) September 6, 1961. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. 30 p.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

U.S. Congress, House message of the President of the United States. Drafts of bills relating to housing. (H. Doc. 206, 88th Cong., 2d sess. Jan. 27, 1964.)

U.S. Congress, message on housing and community development. (H. Doc. 102, 87th Cong., 1st sess. Mar. 9, 1961.)

U.S. Congress, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962. (H. Doc. 320, 87th Cong., 2d sess. Jan. 30, 1962.)

U.S. Congress, state of the Union message. (H. Doc. 73, 87th Cong., 1st sess. Jan. 30, 1961.)

U.S. Congress, House Document 1, 89th Congress, 1st session, January 4, 1965.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN HULL INSURANCE SYNDICATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill, and in connection therewith a memorandum in support thereof.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD along with the memorandum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1600) for the relief of certain members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the provisions of clause (3) of subsection (c) of section 201 of title II of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate, incorporated in the United States, shall be deemed to be "American Nationals" as defined therein but only for the purposes of the said Act.

The memorandum presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN HULL INSURANCE SYNDICATE

The 1962 amendment to the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 87–846) made provision for recovery by the members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate [1] of certain net losses on war risk insurance written during World War II. Unfortunately this amendment deals with many classes of claimants and the general nationality test prescribed by the amendment precludes recovery by certain Royal-Globe Insurance Cos., incorporated in the United States (hereinafter called Royal-Glove Insurance Cos.) though other members of the American Hull

[1] The American Hull Insurance Syndicate was formed pursuant to authorization found in section 29 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 (previously known as "American Marine Insurance Syndicates" and "American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate") (U.S.C.A., sec. 885) for the purpose of providing an American market for marine insurance against loss or damage by fire and against marine risks and disasters of war and other risks. Since 1920 this syndicate has written the major share of insurance on ships owned by U.S. nationals.

Insurance Syndicate are authorized claimants. The annexed private bill is designed to cure this disability and this memorandum is intended to further document the necessity for its introduction.

At the outset of World War II, because of an uncertainty in the law, the U.S. Maritime Commission felt unable to provide insurance against risk of war loss to vessels transporting commodities basic to our war effort. As a stopgap measure the American Hull Insurance Syndicate agreed to write this insurance at stabilized premium rates until the Maritime Commission assumed responsibility, which occurred in April 1942. During the interim period approximately 1,300 ships were either damaged or sunk with a loss to the syndicate members of $191 million. Payment of these losses had the effect of completely wiping out reserves built up by them over a period of more than 20 years.[2]

The Special War Claims Commission reported that in previous conflicts such as World War I, marine insurance companies were recognized as proper claimants by courts and commissions dealing with war claims. This recognition was based upon the fact that insurance is considered a contract of indemnity which adheres to the property insured and the insured suffers no loss to the extent that payments are made by the insurer who thus stands in the shoes of the insured to the extent that he is entitled to recovery. This right of subrogation has long been sanctioned and is implied in such contracts even in the absence of specific language spelling out the right. Despite the recommendations of the Commission that these traditional subrogation claims be validated, it required a long and sustained effort to secure their recognition in Public Law 87-846. Even so, a novel test was inserted which has the effect of denying the Royal-Globe Insurance Cos. any relief in contrast to their recoveries with respect to World War I losses of a similar nature.

This denial is the result of the nationality test contained in section 204 of the 1962 amendment which requires not only that the initial claimant be a fully qualified "national" (which is the traditional test in war claims) but also that the insurance company which paid such a loss also be a fully qualified "national." This "double derivative" test is new and was not contained in World War I legislation. It is submitted that if the general right of subrogation of the insurance companies is recognized, no valid distinction should be based upon a further test of the nationality of the insurer because its claim must fail in any case where the initial claim would fail for any reason, including failure to meet the nationality test. It is an artificial and unnecessary refinement to impose a new and independent nationality test on one whose rights are completely derivative in nature.

Royal-Globe Insurance Cos. made no attempt to withdraw from their obligations nor were their resources rejected in meeting the emergency payment of losses. We respectfully submit that their claim for treatment as equals under the act should be recognized. For the foregoing reasons the private bill attached hereto should be enacted.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN INSURANCE CO.,
GLOBE INDEMNITY CO.,
Successor to Star Insurance Co. of America.
NEWARK INSURANCE CO.,
QUEEN INSURANCE CO. OF AMERICA,
Members of Royal-Globe Insurance Cos.

[2] See, Special War Claims Commission, Jan. 16, 1953, House Document No. 67, 83d Cong., 1st sess.

NEED FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in 1862, Congress passed a bill which President Abraham Lincoln signed into law which established the national cemetery system.

The law provided:

That the President of the United States shall have power, whenever in his opinion it shall be expedient, to purchase cemetery grounds, and cause them to be securely enclosed, to be used as a national cemetery for the soldiers who shall die in the service of the country.

This principle of providing a final resting place for our honored war dead has been carried on for over a hundred years as an expression of the people's gratitude.

We have been involved in two World Wars and numerous armed conflicts since the conclusion of the Civil War and it was apparent that the national cemetery system had to be continued and even expanded to fulfill a moral obligation to our servicemen.

There are 98 national cemeteries in the United States. However, viewed from today's needs the system is inadequate. It has been pointed out that the United States has not made a consistent effort to keep abreast of the growth of the veteran population.

A study has been conducted which showed that "of the 72 national cemeteries now open, 15 will have to close by 1969 and another 12 in the following decade."

Also, the space available is so located as to favor certain veterans and to disfavor others due to an imbalance in the area location of the sites.

There is no national cemetery in Ohio and to use the words of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON:

If we are to fulfill our obligation in having space available for burial of our veterans in a location where their loved ones may visit their grave site, action must be taken to establish additional cemeteries.

Therefore, I send to the desk a bill which would authorize the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1601) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT [redacted], TO PROVIDE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SERVICES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, for the purpose of enabling the Federal Aviation Agency to provide air traffic control services which will be adequate to meet the needs of civil aviation, national defense, and safeguard traffic against the hazard of midair collision.

The proposed bill would provide that air traffic controllers who have accumulated 20 years of active control service in the field shall have the right to retire at the age 50, with the consent of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

In principle it bears some resemblance to the 20-year retirement legislation which Congress has already provided for the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and officers of the Foreign Service, Department of State.

The measure will not extend 20-year retirement to all of the employees of the Agency. Its benefits are limited to those employees who are involved in air safety and is intended to provide the early retirement opportunity to those controllers who have reached the age when they are no longer able to make the rapid and often split-second decisions separating aircraft which are necessary to prevent midair collisions. The existing Civil Service Retirement Act is inadequate for this purpose.

Until recently, the air traffic controller was called the forgotten man of civil aviation. The Secretary of Commerce in 1956 publicly described air traffic controllers as "unsung heroes of aviation."

The Senate Commerce Committee in favorably reporting what is now known as the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 had this to say with respect to air traffic controllers:

Your committee has been impressed with the vital role which these employees play in promoting air safety and in compensating for present technical deficiencies in our air navigation system. As a group, the skill, loyalty, and devotion to duty of the control tower and air route traffic control center personnel is scarcely excelled anywhere in the Government service. The burden placed on these men, especially in high density traffic areas often requires them to put in long, unbroken, nerve-wracking hours of service for which under present personnel regulations they cannot adequately be compensated.

The committee then goes on to say that there should be a study by the Administrator to include ways and means of strengthening the air traffic control service through various measures including special retirement for controllers. Report No. 1811, Senate, 85th Congress, 2d session.

The Congress adopted this recommendation of the Senate committee and the Administrator made the required study which reached the Congress belatedly in September 1961. In his report the Administrator recommended 20-year retirement for air traffic controllers but the bill never was set for hearing by reason of the inability of affected agencies to accept other provisions of the measure.

I desire to make clear, if it is not already apparent, that the purpose of this proposed bill is safety alone.

It would provide air traffic controllers with a realistic retirement policy that will make it possible for controllers to relinquish their vital control responsibilities and retire from the service when they are no longer able to fulfill the high standard of safety that Congress has laid down for air transportation. That

standard is not ordinary safety, but, and I quote from the act "the highest possible degree of safety."

To appreciate the need for earlier retirement for air traffic controllers, I think it is necessary to take a glance at the nature of control work and impact of the job stresses and the natural forces of aging on the controller's ability to meet its demanding duties. The crucial task of the air traffic controller is the traffic decision, the purpose of which is to safeguard against the disaster of midair collision, the lives and property entrusted to him, and at the same time to satisfy the economic demands of industry in providing the most expeditious movement of the traffic and the elimination of traffic delays.

These vital decisions of the controller in this jet era of unparalleled congestion and fabulous speeds must be made in quick time, oftentimes in seconds and even split seconds.

The controller cannot afford the luxury of deliberation for the jets cannot wait. He must have the mental capacity for rapid analysis of the immediate traffic situation, the formulation of a sound decision on momentary facts that are constantly changing, and the almost instantaneous delivery of concise and accurate instructions in critical traffic situations.

This process demands the mental faculties of quick thinking, retentive memory, accurate analysis and judgment under pressure, and concentration. These mental qualities must endure unimpaired if the controller is to fulfill "the highest possible degree of safety" for the traveling public.

Investigation has disclosed that mental faculties requisite to the prevention of midair collision generally slow up as the controller approaches the age of 50; that they deteriorate with age; and that this deterioration is amplified in the case of air traffic controllers by the nerve-racking character of the control work.

Thus the major factors in the declining proficiency of air traffic controllers are the natural forces of aging and the stressful character of the occupation. When that deterioration occurs the controller, regardless of his ripe experience and judgment, is often unable to act safely in complex traffic situations and the short time available to him to make such decisions.

At this point I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the recent age factor study which was conducted by the Federal Aviation Agency through its Civil Aeromedical Institute in Oklahoma on the effects of aging on air traffic control job performance and their implications to safety. One phase of the study was based on a survey of 1,130 individuals who had completed basic training and entered on-the-job training. The report states that the losses during the on-the-job period increased progressively with age ranging from a low of 19 percent for the age group of 21 to 25 years to 86 percent for the individuals of age 45 and older. The FAA states:

> The potential safety hazard due to the increased chance of control errors on the part of the older group is drastically illustrated.

It should be kept in mind that all controllers are not alike in their inability to exercise the particular mental faculties required of the controller. Some will be able to endure beyond 50 and still retain the particular faculties, including even the element of speed, which are essential to the complex task which the law has imposed upon controllers. But the majority, like the baseball player, will be unable to avoid the inevitable forces of aging with the slowing-up effects which they entail.

What I am saying here today does not mean that airplanes in great numbers are falling from the air as a result of conditions that now exist in the Air Traffic Control Service.

What I do mean is that conditions are building up in our air space as a result of the revolutionary changes which have taken place in aviation which give warning of future trouble unless we do something about it. The number of near collisions, or "near misses" as they are sometimes called, are part of the handwriting on the wall, and we should give heed to this warning.

We must today anticipate the future and devise necessary measures to prevent future mishaps. We should not act only after a disaster has occurred.

I sincerely hope that early and favorable action will be taken on this measure, which I believe is vitally necessary in the field of air safety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1602) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 for the purpose of enabling the Federal Aviation Agency to provide air traffic control services which will be adequate to meet the needs of civil aviation and the national defense, and to safeguard air traffic against the hazard of midair collision, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF PROJECTS IN CERTAIN COMPREHENSIVE RIVER BASIN PLANS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, pursuant to recent testimony by the Corps of Engineers before the Senate Public Works Committee, the Congress should seriously consider the necessity of passing a special bill providing "monetary authorization" for fiscal year 1966 to make possible the continued development of some 10 river basin projects which are approaching ceiling limitations on authorizations.

This action is necessitated by the possibility that the omnibus rivers and harbors bill may not become law in time to assure monetary authorization for these basin projects before they reach the ceiling limitations on present authorizations established under the last omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

The basins covered by the bill I am introducing today are: Arkansas, Brazos, central and southern Florida, Columbia River, Los Angeles-San Gabriel, Missouri River, Ohio River, Ouachita, upper Mississippi River, and West Branch, Susquehanna River. In this bill authorization for 1 additional year is provided. It is thought authorizations needed for additional years would remain in the omnibus bill.

These 10 basin developments are facing work stoppage unless "monetary authorizations" are made early in fiscal year 1966.

As stated by Maj. Gen. Jackson Graham, Director of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, before the Senate Public Works Committee, on March 22, 1965:

> At the present time there are 21 river basin or major project plans which are subject to monetary authorization ceilings. Unless additional authorization is provided early in fiscal year 1966 work will have to be either suspended or slowed on 10 of these during the fiscal year. If we continue obligations as originally scheduled, monetary authorizations wil be exhausted for 9 of the 10 on July 1, 1965; and for the 10th by early October. The situation is most critical with respect to the Arkansas, central and southern Florida, Columbia, Los Angeles County, Upper Mississippi, and West Branch Susquehanna plans and projects on which available monetary authorization ceilings will be exhausted during the first few months of fiscal year 1966, based on obligating remaining balances essentially month by month, consistent with scheduled progress on each contract and required supporting features. A slowdown of construction progress is inherent in this procedure. On four others, the Ohio, Missouri, Ouachita, and Brazos, we can perhaps continue through the end of December 1965 before it would be necessary to suspend further activity. We believe needed work on the affected basin plans and projects can be continued in an orderly and efficient manner if additional authorizations are provided now to permit continuance on the basis of anticipated obligations through fiscal year 1968.

Recent authorization ceilings established in 1962 will be exhausted during the first few months of fiscal year 1966. Thus, we would be faced with a virtual shutdown on these projects, some of which were approved by Congress as far back as 1936. We are concerned here with monetary authorizations—apart from appropriations—which are necessary to permit continuing implementation of these projects in an orderly and efficient manner. The Corps of Engineers has an approved budget of slightly over $1 billion for fiscal year 1966. These projects are included in this budget, and lack only the authorization by the Congress in order to receive the needed appropriations to keep them on schedule. Through passage of this bill, we would avoid any increase in costs to the Federal Government involved in renegotiating contracts, rising construction costs, and expenditures involved in updating plans and procedures.

Therefore, Mr. President, for myself, Senator MONRONEY, Senator MORSE, Senator YARBOROUGH, and others, I send to the desk for introduction and appropriate reference a bill authorizing appropriations for these projects in order to guard against any delay in construction plans during fiscal year 1966, and I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD and lie at the desk until the close of business, Thursday, April 1, to give opportunity for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 1605) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan of development of each river basin under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army referred to in the first column below, which was basically authorized by the act referred to by date of enactment in the second column below, an amount equal to that shown opposite such river basin in the third column below:

[Millions of dollars]

Basin and act of Congress, amount:	
Arkansas River, June 28, 1933	115
Brazos River, Tex., Sept. 3, 1954	6
Central and southern Florida, June 30, 1948	11
Columbia River, June 28, 1938	73
Los Angeles-San Gabriel, Aug. 18, 1941	10
Missouri River, June 28, 1938	24
Ohio River, June 22, 1936	3
Ouachita, May 17, 1950	1
Upper Mississippi River, June 28, 1938	14
West Branch, Susquehanna River, Sept. 3, 1954	6
Total	263

PUNISHMENT FOR ASSAULT OR KILLING OF ANY EMPLOYEE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE OR THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make it a Federal crime to assault or kill certain employees of the Department of Agriculture or the Public Health Service engaged in performing inspection duties at ports of entry or border stations of the United States.

Under sections 111 and 1114, title 18, United States Code, it is a crime for any person to assault or kill certain employees of the United States while engaged in their duties.

My bill would merely extend the protection to certain employees of the Department of Agriculture engaged in certain inspection services at ports of entry and border stations of the United States and to Department of Agriculture employees when they assist in the performance of customs immigration duties at such ports of entry and border stations. It would also extend sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 to cover certain officers and employees of the Public Health Service when such officers and employees are engaged in certain inspection services.

These Federal employees should be accorded as much protection in their work as other Federal department or agency employees assigned in the same areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1606) to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal crime to assault or kill any employee of the Department of Agriculture or the Public Health Service when such employee is engaged in certain inspection duties at ports of entry or border stations of the United States; introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE, CALIF.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduced for appropriate reference a bill to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1607) to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk for 1 week—that is to say, until next Thursday, April 1, for possible cosponsors.

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

AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO INCREASE THE ANNUAL AMOUNT OF EARNINGS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the pension benefits payable to them.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, that it be printed and appropriately referred, and that it lie over through next Thursday for the addition of additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie over until next Thursday, April 1, for additional cosponsors, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 1608) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) (1) paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) (B) of subsection (f) of section 203 of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out "$100" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$150".

(2) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of such subsection (f) is amended by striking out "$500" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$600".

(b) Paragraph (1) (A) of subsection (h) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out "$100" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after June 1965.

SEC. 3. In addition to all sums which are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund under other provisions of law, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to such Fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to place such Fund in the same financial position as that which it would have occupied if the preceding sections of this Act had not been enacted.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, under present law, benefits are withheld from those under age 72 at the rate of $1 for each $2 of annual earnings between $1,200 and $1,700 and $1 for each $1 of annual earnings above $1,700.

My proposed bill would change the law so that benefits would be withheld at the rate of $1 for each $2 of annual earnings over $1,800, instead of the present $1,200; and $2,400 instead of the present $1,700 would be the limit for cutting off benefits.

The bill also provides that the increase in costs shall be taken from the general revenue of the Treasury. The explanation for this is simple—to avoid a further drain upon the $320 billion in unfunded liabilities of the social security fund.

Mr. President, many social security pensioners simply must augment their pensions in order to make ends meet. This is particularly true of those who have a low earnings base and whose pensions are therefore low.

My bill will enable them to become more self-sufficient which, in itself, is a status that lends itself to the peace of mind due our older citizens. It recognizes the importance of income for older persons as the basis for independence and dignity.

DESIGNATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN THEATER AS A COMBAT ZONE FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it will be recalled that on January 12 I introduced S. 459 designating the southeast Asian theater as a combat zone for income tax purposes.

Since that time I have become aware of a defect in the original bill in that it was not sufficiently retroactive to cover servicemen who have served our Nation in Vietnam since the real beginning of the American buildup there.

Therefore, I now send to the desk a revised bill that would be retroactive to January 1, 1961, and I ask that the text

of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1614) to designate Vietnam as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes, effective retroactively to January 1, 1961, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 112(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of combat zone) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The term 'combat zone' also means the area comprising (A) Vietnam, and (B) the waters and land areas adjacent to Vietnam as designated by the President by Executive order for purposes of this section."

(b) Section 112(c)(3) of such Code (relating to service performed in a combat zone) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Service is performed in the combat zone of Vietnam if performed on or after January 1, 1961, and on or before the date designated by the President by Executive order as the date of the termination of combatant activities in such zone."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable year 1961 and all subsequent years, including the full year during which the President proclaims termination of combatant activities as prescribed in Section 1(b) of this Act.

INCOME TAX CREDITS AND INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR EDUCATION EXPENSES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to provide income tax credits and income tax deductions for education expenses on all levels. This is essentially the same bill I sponsored last session.

May I say that in addition to the bill I now propose, I am an active cosponsor of S. 12 by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. I hope S. 12 will receive favorable action here this session along with the measure I now propose.

My bill has three main provisions:

First. It provides a tax credit for homeowners for that portion of their real property tax which is used for maintenance, operation, and construction of public elementary and secondary schools. Every such taxpayer would obtain this education assistance whether or not his children attend public school.

Second. It provides a tax credit for individuals and corporations for gifts and contributions made to nonprofit institutions of higher education. This contribution credit could not exceed $100 for an individual and $1,000 for a corporation.

Third. It provides a tax deduction for taxpayers who are themselves students or whose spouses or children are attending college. College expenses covered by this bill would include tuition and fees; books, supplies and equipment; and room and board. Total deductions would be limited to $2,000 for each student attending college, and the coverage for room and board would be limited to no more than $90 per month. A progressive limitation feature would curtail the amount of deduction granted to taxpayers with higher incomes.

Mr. President, as a former college professor, I am fully aware of the worries of many American families about the adequacy of our schools and their curricula. I am equally aware of the worries of many families that the costs of college education for their children are far beyond their means.

This is a pressing problem in which the very future of our Nation is at stake. Additional American resources must be applied to the needs of education.

It is my belief that the tax credit and deduction approach is the best way to apply those needed resources. Although other plans have been put forward, this approach has, it seems to me, two key advantages contained in no other plan now being discussed.

First, the tax credit approach preserves local and State control and supervision for education.

Second, the tax credit approach eliminates the troublesome question about separation of church and state.

Under the tax credit and tax deduction plan for aid to education, the taxpayers' money never leaves his control; that money never is sent to Washington and partially sent back to local schools and colleges. Thus, there are no Federal strings attached, no control strings, and no strings that can tangle in the consitutional brierpatch surrounding private and religious-backed schools.

Under the tax credit plan, such as I now propose again, the taxpayer applies his money wherever and whenever he wants. He decides how best to educate his children and then does it. And under this legislation he will have a choice of greatly expanded and improved educational institutions from the first grade through the university.

May I emphasize again that this tax relief approach offers an acceptable means of channeling greatly increased new funds into education, tax supported or privately supported, State controlled or independent, secular or religious. And, this is accomplished within the framework of a policy long acknowledged by the Congress—a policy of giving incentive to taxpayers to make voluntary contributions to programs benefiting both individuals and the entire society.

I believe these bills would help preserve the diversity and flexibility of the whole American educational system, a diversity of vital importance in maintenance of the freedoms and pluralism so cherished in our national life.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1615) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives for the support of educational institutions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by renumbering section 39 as section 41, and by inserting after section 38 the following new sections:

"SEC. 39. REAL PROPERTY TAXES PAID FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the taxes on real property paid or accrued during the taxable year which are imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education, but only to the extent that such taxes do not exceed the lesser of—

"(1) $100, or

"(2) the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the credits allowable under section 32 (relating to tax withheld at source on nonresident aliens and foreign corporations and on tax-free covenant bonds), section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), section 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), section 37 (relating to retirement income), and section 38 (relating to investment in certain depreciable property).

"(b) INCOME TAX BENEFITS NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT OF REAL PROPERTY TAXES PAID FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.—If the amount allowable (but for this subsection) as a credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year, when added to the amount by which the tax under this chapter for the taxable year is less by reason of the deduction allowed under section 164 for real property taxes for which credit is otherwise allowable under subsection (a), exceeds the total amount of real property taxes paid or accrued during the taxable year which are imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education, the amount allowable as a credit under subsection (a) shall be reduced by an amount equal to such excess.

"(c) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF REAL PROPERTY TAX PAID FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.—For purposes of subsection (a), the amount of any tax on real property which is imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education shall be—

"(1) with respect to any real property tax imposed solely for such support, the amount of such tax; and

"(2) with respect to any real property tax imposed in part for such support, the portion of such tax—

"(A) designated in the bill for such tax submitted to the taxpayer by the taxing jurisdiction imposing such tax; or

"(B) determined from information set forth in such bill or from information furnished to the taxpayer by such taxing jurisdiction, as the amount of such tax which is imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education.

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) TAXES MUST BE DEDUCTIBLE.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any real property tax unless such tax is allowable as a deduction for the taxable year under section 164.

"(2) TAXES CONSTRUCTIVELY PAID.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the provisions of subsections (d), (e), and (f) of section 164 shall apply to real property taxes with respect to which credit is allowable under subsection (a).

"SEC. 40. CONTRIBUTIONS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount (subject to the limitations of subsection (b)) equal to the amount of contributions by the taxpayer, payment of which is made within the taxable year, to or for the use of one or more institutions of higher education.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) INDIVIDUALS, ETC.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, the credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed $100.

"(2) CORPORATIONS.—In the case of a corporation, the credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed $10,000.

"(c) CONTRIBUTIONS TO WHICH APPLICABLE.—Subsection (a) shall apply to a contribution to or for the use of an institution of higher education only if—

"(1) such contribution is a charitable contribution within the meaning of section 170(c), and

"(2) if such contribution is made for the use of an institution of higher education but is not paid to such institution and is not made available to it by the recipient, such contribution may be used by the recipient only for the same purposes for which such institution of higher education may expend its funds.

"(d) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' means only a duly accredited educational institution—

"(1) which normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly organized body of students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are carried on,

"(2) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade, and

"(3) contributions to or for the use of which constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170(c).

"(e) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed on the taxpayer for the taxable year by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than under this section and section 31).

"(f) CORRELATION WITH SECTION 170.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Deduction shall not be denied under section 170 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts), for contributions to institutions of higher education otherwise allowable as a deduction under such section, by reason of the fact that such contributions are taken into account in determining the credit allowable under subsection (a).

"(2) REDUCTION OF CREDIT.—If the amount allowable (but for this paragraph) for any taxable year as a credit under subsection (a) for contributions to institutions of higher education, when added to the amount by which the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year is less by reason of the allowance of a deduction under section 170 for such contributions, exceeds the amount of such contributions, then the amount allowable as a credit under subsection (a) shall be reduced by an amount equal to such excess.

"(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 39. Real property taxes paid for support of public education.

"Sec. 40. Contributions to institutions of higher education.

"Sec. 41. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 2. (a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 218 as section 219, and by inserting after section 217 the following new section:

"SEC. 218. EXPENSES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction the expenses for higher education paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year which are incurred by him, by his spouse, or by a dependent (as defined in section 152(a)).

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) EXPENSES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'expenses for higher education' means amounts paid for—

"(A) tuition and fees required by an institution of higher education for attendance at such institution;

"(B) fees required by an institution of higher education for a course of instruction at such institution;

"(C) books, supplies, and equipment certified by an institution of higher education as necessary for a course of instruction at such institution; and

"(D) meals and lodging while attending an institution of higher education, but only if the individual for whom such amounts are paid is, at the time such expenses for meals and lodging are incurred, a full-time student at such institution or is enrolled in courses having at least one-half of the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student.

"(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4))—

"(A) which is accredited by a recognized national or regional accrediting agency, and

"(B)(i) which is authorized to confer any baccalaureate or higher degree, or (ii) whose curriculum consists of courses at least two-thirds of which are courses of instruction within the meaning of this section.

"(3) COURSE OF INSTRUCTION.—The term 'course of instruction' means a course of instruction for the successful completion of which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree by an institution of higher education authorized to confer such degree, or which is required for graduation by the institution of higher education offering such course.

"(c) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) EXPENSES OF EACH INDIVIDUAL.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses for higher education of any one individual paid during the taxable year only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $2,000.

"(2) SPOUSE.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses for higher education of the spouse of the taxpayer paid during the taxable year only if—

"(A) the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his spouse under section 151(b) for the taxable year, or

"(B) the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year.

"(3) MEALS AND LODGING.—

"(A) FULL-TIME STUDENTS.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses for higher education described in subsection (b)(1)(D) paid during the taxable year which are incurred by any individual who at the time such expenses are incurred is a full-time student only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed—

"(i) in the case of such expenses incurred while the individual is attending an educational institution away from home, $90, multiplied by the number of months during the taxable year in which the individual attends an educational institution away from home, or if greater, by the number of months for which payment is made during the taxable year for meals and lodging for the individual while he is attending an educational institution away from home; or

"(ii) in the case of such expenses incurred while the individual is attending an educational institution not away from home, $45, multiplied by the number of months during the taxable year in which the individual attends an institution of higher education not away from home, or, if greater, by the number of months for which payment is made during the taxable year for meals and lodging for the individual while he is attending an educational institution not away from home.

"(B) LESS THAN FULL-TIME STUDENTS.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses of higher education described in subsection (b)(1)(D) paid during the taxable year which are incurred by any individual who at the time such expenses are incurred is not a full-time student but who is enrolled in courses having at least one-half of the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed an amount determined under subparagraph (A)(i) or (ii), whichever is applicable, except that, for purposes of this subparagraph, there shall be substituted for $90 in subparagraph (A)(i), and for $45 in subparagraph (A)(ii), an amount which bears the same ratio to $90 or $45, as the case may be, as the number of hours in which such individual is enrolled bears to the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student.

"(C) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), a month during which an individual attends an institution of higher education for less than 10 days shall be disregarded; and an individual who is attending an institution of higher education not away from home, but who is required by such institution to accept meals and lodging furnished by such institution, shall be treated as if he is attending an institution of higher education away from home. For purposes of this section, the amounts paid for meals and lodging of an individual while he is attending an institution of higher education not away from home shall, in the case of meals and lodging furnished to such individual by the taxpayer, be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(4) OTHER PERSONAL AND LIVING EXPENSES.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), deduction shall not be allowed under subsection (a) for any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for any personal or living expenses. In the event an amount paid as tuition or fees includes an amount for any personal or living expense (including meals or lodging) which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount paid which is attributable to such personal or living expense shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(5) TAXPAYERS HAVING SUBSTANTIAL TAXABLE INCOME.—The amount which (but for this paragraph) would be allowable as a deduction under subsection (a) shall be reduced by the amount by which the taxable income of the taxpayer (computed without regard to this section) exceeds—

"(A) $10,000, if the taxpayer is unmarried and is not a head of a household (as defined in section 1(b)(2)) for the taxable year, or is married and files a separate return for the taxable year, or

"(b) $20,000, if the taxpayer is married and files a joint return with his spouse for the

taxable year, or is a head of a household or surviving spouse for the taxable year.

"(d) REDUCTION FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS, AND VETERANS' BENEFITS.—The expenses for higher education paid by the taxpayer with respect to any individual which (but for this subsection) would be taken into account under subsection (a), shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be reduced by any amounts received by or for such individual during the taxable year as—

"(1) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which, under section 117, is not includible in gross income, or

"(2) education and training allowance under chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code or educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title.

"(e) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid which is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses)."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 218. Expenses for higher education.
"Sec. 219. Cross references."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

S. 1616—PUNISHMENT FOR PERSONS TRANSPORTING OR RECEIVING STOLEN ANIMALS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, for some time the members of the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association have felt that sheep and goats should be included in present legislation that makes it a violation of section 2316, title 18 of the United States Code, to transport stolen cattle across State lines.

I feel that this is a fully justified and reasonable concern of importance to sheep and goat raisers from other States as well, and I therefore offer an amendment to correct this shortcoming of present law.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1616) to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen sheep or goats in interstate or foreign commerce and of persons selling or receiving stolen sheep or goats transported in interstate or foreign commerce, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1616

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2311 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately after the paragraph containing the definition of "securities", the following new paragraph:

" 'Sheep or goats' means one or more sheep or goats, or the carcass or carcasses thereof;"

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2316 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2316. Transportation of cattle, sheep, or goats

"Whoever transports in interstate or foreign commerce any cattle, sheep, or goats, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO FHA-INSURED AND GUARANTEED MORTGAGES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, bills to provide for a temporary moratorium on payments under FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages for mortgagors, who are unemployed, or in the case of servicemen, transferred as the result of the closing of a Federal installation.

The enactment of this legislation would lessen the impact on those Federal employees and servicemen adversely affected by the closing of Federal facilities throughout the country.

It is certainly a fact that such employees have contributed much to serving their country. Now, as a result of base closings, many of these civilian employees are being forced to seek employment in areas far removed from their present homes.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that most of the base employees would prefer to remain in their respective communities, where they have their homes, where they have raised and are raising their families, where they are an integral part of the community life.

It is usually difficult, of course, for those separated from base employment to find other employment immediately, particularly since there will be in many of the areas a labor surplus market, at least temporarily.

The most important aspect of these bills in providing for a moratorium on home payments, for civilians, is to give additional time to those affected to find employment in the immediate area. The serviceman would be afforded additional time to sell his home, and would not have to dispose of it under such adverse market conditions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills be inserted into the RECORD at this point. I ask that the bills lay on the table for additional cosponsors through Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bills, introduced by Mr. TOWER, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1617. A bill to provide for a temporary moratorium on payments under FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages for mortgagors who are unemployed as the result of the closing of a Federal installation, and for other purposes.

S. 1617

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

(1) The term "mortgage" means a mortgage which (A) is insured under the National Housing Act, or (B) secures a home loan guaranteed or insured under the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term "Federal mortgage agency" means—

(A) the Federal Housing Commissioner when used in connection with mortgages insured under the National Housing Act, and

(B) the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs when used in connection with mortgages securing home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

(3) The term "distressed mortgagor" means an individual who—

(A) is unemployed, although willing to work, as the result of the closing (in whole or in part) of a Federal installation, and

(B) is the owner-occupant of a dwelling upon which there is a mortgage securing a loan which is in default because of the inability of such individual to make payments of principal and/or interest under such mortgage.

SEC. 2. (a) Any distressed mortgagor, for the purpose of avoiding foreclosure of his mortgage, may apply to the appropriate Federal mortgage agency for a determination that suspension of his obligation to make payments of principal and/or interest under such mo tgage during a temporary period is necessary in order to avoid such foreclosure.

(b) Upon receipt of an application made under this section by a distressed mortgagor, the Federal mortgage agency shall issue to such mortgagor a certificate of moratorium if it determines, after consultation with the interested mortgagee, that—

(1) the mortgagor is not in default with respect to any condition or covenant of the mortgage other than that requiring the payment of installments of principal and/or interest under the mortgage, and

(2) such action is the only available means whereby a foreclosure of such mortgage can be avoided.

(c) Prior to the issuance to any distressed mortgagor of a certificate of moratorium under subsection (b), the Federal mortgage agency shall require such mortgagor to enter into a binding agreement under which he will be required to make payments to such agency, after the expiration of such certificate, in an aggregate amount equal to the amount paid by such agency in behalf of such mortgagor as provided in section 3. The manner and time in which such payments shall be made shall be determined by the Federal mortgage agency having due regard to the purposes sought to be achieved by this Act.

(d) Any certificate of moratorium issued under this section shall expire on whichever of the following dates is the earliest—

(1) one year from the date on which such certificate is issued;

(2) thirty days after the date on which the mortgagor to whom such certificate is issued ceases to be a distressed mortgagor as defined in the first section of this Act; or

(3) the date on which such mortgagor becomes in default with respect to any condition or covenant in his mortgage other than that requiring the payment by him of installments of principal and/or interest under the mortgage.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever a Federal mortgage agency issues a certificate of moratorium to any distressed mortgagor with respect to any mortgage, it shall transmit to the mortgagee a copy of such certificate, together with a notice stating that, while such certificate is in effect, such agency will assume the obligation of such mortgagor to make payments of principal, and, if so specified in the certificate, of interest, under the mortgage.

(b) Payments made by any Federal mortgage agency pursuant to a certificate of

moratorium issued under this Act with respect to the mortgage of any distressed mortgagor shall include, in addition to the payments referred to in subsection (a), an amount equal to the unpaid principal and interest charges which had accrued under such mortgage prior to the issuance of such certificate and subsequent to the date on which such mortgagor became a distressed mortgagor as defined in the first section of this Act.

(c) While any certificate of moratorium issued under this Act is in effect with respect to the mortgage of any distressed mortgagor, no further payments of principal, and, if so specified in the certificate, of interest, under the mortgage shall be required of such mortgagor, and no action (legal or otherwise) shall be taken or maintained by the mortgagee to enforce or collect such payments. Upon the expiration of such certificate, the mortgagor shall again be liable for the payment of all amounts due under the mortgage in accordance with its terms.

(d) Each Federal mortgage agency shall give prompt notice in writing to the interested mortgagor and mortgagee of the expiration of any certificate of moratorium issued by it under this Act.

SEC. 4. The Federal mortgage agencies are authorized to issue such individual and joint regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act and to insure the uniform administration thereof.

SEC. 5. There shall be in the Treasury (1) a fund which shall be available to the Federal Housing Commissioner for the purpose of extending financial assistance in behalf of distressed mortgagors as provided in section 3, and (2) a fund which shall be available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the same purpose. The capital of each such fund shall consist of such sums as may, from time to time, be appropriated thereto, and any sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. Receipts arising from the programs of assistance under section 3 shall be credited to the fund from which such assistance was extended. Moneys in either of such funds not needed for current operations, as determined by the Federal Housing Commissioner, or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as the case may be, shall be invested in bonds or other obligations of the United States, or paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 6. Section 1816 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the text of such section, and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) With respect to any loan made under section 1811 which has not been sold as provided in subsection (g) of such section, if the Administrator finds after there has been a default in the payment of any installment of principal or interest owing on such loan, that the default was due to the fact that the veteran who is obligated under the loan has become unemployed as the result of the closing (in whole or in part) of a Federal installation, he shall (1) extend the time for curing the default to such time as he determines is necessary and desirable to enable such veteran to complete payments on such loan, including an extension of time beyond the stated maturity thereof, or (2) modify the terms of such loan for the purpose of changing the amortization provisions thereof by recasting, over the remaining term of the loan, or over such longer period as he may determine, the total unpaid amount then due with the modification to become effective currently or upon the termination of an agreed-upon extension of the period for curing the default."

S. 1618. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain housing owned by servicemen at or near Federal bases or installations which have been, or are being, closed in whole or in part.

S. 1618

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

(1) The term "mortgage" means a mortgage which (A) is insured under the National Housing Act, or (B) secures a home loan guaranteed, insured, or made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 on chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term "Federal mortgage agency" means—

(A) the Federal Housing Commissioner when used in connection with mortgages insured under the National Housing Act, and

(B) the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs when used in connection with mortgages securing home loans guaranteed, insured, or made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

(3) The term "serviceman" means a person who is serving on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States or in the United States Coast Guard.

(4) The term "property" means real property improved with a one- or two-family dwelling which is owned by a serviceman.

SEC. 2. (a) A Federal mortgage agency is authorized to acquire title to any property upon which there is an outstanding mortgage, if it determines—

(1) that such property is situated at or near a Federal base or installation which has been, or has been ordered to be, closed in whole or in part;

(2) that the owner of such property has been, or is being, transferred from such base or installation;

(3) that as the result of the actual or pending closing of such base or installation there is no present market for the sale of such property upon reasonable terms and conditions; and

(4) that if such property is not acquired, as herein provided, foreclosure of the mortgage thereon will in all probability be required.

(b) The purchase price of any property acquired hereunder shall not exceed an amount, determined by the Federal mortgage agency to be necessary, to enable the owner (1) to retire any outstanding obligation owing on the mortgage covering such property, and (2) to recover the value of his equity interest in such property.

SEC. 3. (a) The Federal mortgage agencies are authorized to issue such individual and joint regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act and to insure the uniform administration thereof. Such regulations shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which payments may be made under the provisions of this section, and decisions by the Federal Housing Commissioner or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as the case may be, regarding such payments, and the terms and conditions under which the same are approved or disapproved, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to judicial review.

(b) Each Federal mortgage agency shall have power to deal with, rent, renovate, or sell for cash or credit any properties acquired by it pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 4. Section 223(a) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or"; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) a new paragraph as follows:

"(8) executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any housing acquired pursuant to an Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the acquisition of certain housing owned by servicemen at or near Federal bases or installations which have been, or are being, closed in whole or in part.' "

SEC. 5. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated, and any sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

RETIREMENT PAY OF VETERANS WOUNDED IN COMBAT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which amends Public Law 88–132 to provide that veterans who are retired because of combat wounds may receive the same increases in basic pay per grade which are given to persons of the same rank who remain in service. It seems to me that this is a just and human recognition of the service rendered by those who were so severely wounded that they were required to retire from the service. I ask that a more detailed statement in support of the bill and the bill itself be printed in the RECORD.

Lest any questions be raised about a possible conflict of interest on my part it may be appropriate to state that, first, I have not drawn any disability retirement pay since I came to the Senate over 16 years ago; and second, when I retire, I will not accept any increase to which I might otherwise be entitled if this amendment is passed.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement in support of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1619) to permit members and former members of the Armed Forces retired on or after October 1, 1963, for physical disabilities incurred as a direct result of armed conflict to have their retirement pay recomputed whenever the rates of basic pay applicable to the grade in which they retired are increased, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF DOUGLAS BILL TO PROVIDE THAT VETERANS WHO ARE RETIRED BECAUSE OF COMBAT WOUNDS MAY RECEIVE THE SAME INCREASES IN BASIC PAY PER GRADE WHICH ARE GIVEN TO PERSONS OF THE SAME RANK WHO REMAIN IN SERVICE

On October 2, 1963, Public Law 88–132 was enacted with an effective date of October 1, 1963.

With exceptions not herein relative, the 1963 act freezes the service members' pay at retirement except insofar as changes in the Consumer Price Index are found to occur. Prior to this legislation, all persons in retirement pay status received amounts computed as a percentage (maximum 75 percent) of "monthly basic pay" at retirement with certain adjustments.

Monthly basic pay is found by examining tables which state a specific sum for grade and length of service. Prior to the 1963 amendment, retired persons received some benefit from increases in active duty military pay because the formula defined "monthly basic pay" so as to reflect later adjustments in "applicable permanent rates." (The tables.) Thus, a colonel who retired after 20 years with 50 percent of his base pay used to get the benefit thereafter of all pay raises for 20-year colonels—to the extent of 50 per-

cent. The 1963 amendment eliminated this and now persons retired—for whatever cause—can never receive a pay increase except as the Consumer Price Index is found to rise by 3 percent or more in a given year.

The proposed legislation would have the effect of repealing the 1963 amendment for the benefit only of persons retired for disabilities resulting from combat wounds. This change is urged because:

1. Unlike retirees who receive pay because of 20 or more years of service, and who can plan their futures, a combat wounded disabled veteran is often prevented from completing his career. Thus, by the very act of serving his country to the utmost, short of death, he is deprived of the emoluments which flow from promotions and longevity.

2. By the 1963 act, largely an economy measure, the Congress appears to have turned its back on and broken faith with a group of men who heretofore could look to some betterment in their lives, at least to the extent that military personnel in general received pay raises. While reasons of economy may justify the 1963 change as to regular retirees, special consideration should be given to those who are struck down and crippled by enemy fire.

3. As the course of history seems unfortunately to indicate the strong possibility of more brush fire wars, the Congress should show special consideration for those few who are in the future wounded in these actions.

4. One needs no course in economics to realize that the benefit that might enure by reason of Consumer Price Index changes in no way can compensate for the deprivation occasioned by the 1963 amendment.

5. The cost to the Government will be inconsequential. Statistics will no doubt show that the number of people who retire due to combat wound disability is quite limited.

6. It appears harsh, thoughtless, and unnecessary that frequently a man who never goes into battle can rise to a level of high rank and pay, while his combat colleague, crippled in his prime, must take the measure of his country's gratitude in a frozen pay scale.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE TWO JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto. This bill has just been approved by the judicial conference of the United States at its March meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1620) to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 202(b) OF FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act with respect to the interconnection of electric facilities. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1621) to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act with respect to the interconnection of electric facilities, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee are 20 copies of a draft bill to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act to give the Commission authority to direct the interconnection of electric facilities "on its own motion" and not only "upon application" as is now provided. The proposal was before the 88th Congress in S. 2050 and H.R. 8209.

The Commission is now authorized to order interconnections, after opportunity for hearing, upon application by a State commission or by any person engaged in the transmission and sale of electric energy, where such action does not compel the enlargement of generating facilities or impair a public utility's ability to render adequate service to its customers. The proposal, without changing the standards or procedure presently incorporated in the section, will permit the Commission to take the initiative where it believes the public interest would be benefited by ordering such interconnection.

The Commission's recent National Power Survey has demonstrated the large extent to which the public can benefit by increased interconnections among the Nation's electric utility systems. As the report makes clear, the initiative for major interconnection efforts must come from the various utility systems themselves. There will be situations, however, where studies by the Commission will indicate a need for an interconnection or sale or exchange of energy based on information not available to a person who could apply under existing law. This is especially true with respect to the more than 3,000 small systems throughout the Nation, many of whom could greatly benefit from interties with larger systems in their general area but who do not have the resources or bargaining power to negotiate an interconnection on fair terms.

For these reasons it is our view that this proposal to authorize the Commission to initiate interconnection proceedings is clearly in the public interest. The requirements for hearing and the existing limitations upon the circumstances in which the Commission can order interconnections (which we do not propose to change) will fully protect the public utilities from any undue interference in their established mode of operation. Similar authority to permit the agency to initiate action to require interconnecion or coordinaion in the public interest is granted to both the Federal Communications Commission (see 47 U.S.C. 201, 214) and the Interstate Commerce Commission (see 49 U.S.C. 1(14) and (21), 15).

The proposed amendment would close a large gap in the Commission's program to help develop a coordinated system of power supply in this country in which the benefits of interconnections and power pooling are shared by the consumers of all systems, the small as well as the large. We therefore urge its adoption.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT TO PROHIBIT ABANDONMENT OF CERTAIN FACILITIES AND SERVICE WITHOUT CONSENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1622) to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted for consideration by the appropriate committee are 20 copies of a draft bill to amend the Federal Power Act by adding a new subsection (g) to section 202. The amendment would prohibit a public utility from abandoning or curtailing interstate electric service or facilities, unless the Commission found, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that the abandonment or curtailment is consistent with the public interest. The proposal is comparable to the provisions of section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act governing abandonment of service and facilities by natural gas companies. Bills which would have accomplished the objective of this proposal were introduced in the 88th Congress at the request of the Commission (H.R. 6835; S. 1699).

The Commission's recently published National Power Survey Report highlights the increasing importance of interstate electric service as the electric industry expands its interconnections across State lines to take full advantage of the economies of coordinated operations. It is essential that electric power distributors relying upon wholesale service be assured of an abundant supply of electricity to meet the growing demands of their customers. The assurance of continued service at just and reasonable rates beyond the term of existing contracts is essential if small systems are to be encouraged to enter into wholesale power arrangements with the larger systems.

While it has been held that abandonment of established service constitutes a change in a rate schedule subject to the provisions of section 205 of the act (see *Pennsylvania Water & Power Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 343 U.S. 414, 423–424 (1952)), the degree of protection this section provides to distributors may not always prove adequate. This results from the fact that when a public utility files a new schedule under section 205 proposing to abandon or limit

existing service the filing can only be suspended by the Commission, pending hearing as to its lawfulness, for a maximum period of 5 months. If the Commission has not reached a determination of the matter at the end of the suspension period, the abandonment or limitation on service can be make effective by the utility. Since the small distribution system cannot run the risk of even a temporary break in service it is important that the Commission be vested with direct authority to pass upon any proposed abandonment or curtailment of service in advance of such action.

The Commission urges the adoption of the bill.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

CONTINUING STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF CERTAIN PESTICIDES UPON FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the last Congress, the Commerce Committee heard the late Rachel Carson, the famed biologist whose "Silent Spring" alerted millions of Americans to the potential danger from the uncontrolled use of pesticides, call for expanded "research on the effect of pesticides on fish and wildlife and for public education in these matters." As Miss Carson noted, fish and wildlife possess not only "sentimental and esthetic importance" but are critical "to the national economy and to the revenues of our States." She told us:

During 1962, 19,403,465 of our Nation's residents purchased fishing licenses in our 50 States, paying for these licenses a total of $54,163,163. This revenue will be lost if the fish disappear.

In this same year 13,996,353 bought hunting licenses, according to the latest, but incomplete, information from the Fish and Wildlife Service, paying for these licenses the total sum of $63,983,798. Again, this revenue will be gone if our game birds and animals are exterminated.

Our commercial fisheries employ directly 212,000 of our citizens and last year produced fishery products valued at $381 million harvested in this country.

The authorization for pesticide research by the Department of the Interior is now limited to an annual appropriation of $2,565,000. In his message to Congress on Natural Beauty, President Johnson dealt with this limitation:

Pesticides may affect living organisms wherever they occur.

In order that we may better understand the effects of those compounds, I have included increased funds in the budget for use by the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare to increase their research efforts on pesticides so they can give special attention to the flow of pesticides through the environment; study the means by which pesticides break down and disappear in nature; and to keep a constant check on the level of pesticides in our water, air, soil, and food supply.

I have asked the Secretary of the Interior to submit legislation to eliminate the ceiling on pesticide research.

The bill which I introduce today at the request of the Secretary of the Interior will eliminate that ceiling. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and the letter from the Secretary of the Interior be printed at the close of my remarks, together with a recent release from the Department of the Interior announcing the development of guidelines for testing the toxicity of new pesticides to fish and wildlife.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1623) to amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1623

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of August 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 479), as amended by the Act of September 16, 1959 (73 Stat. 563), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The letter and release, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1965.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource."

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

In the report of the President's Science Advisory Committee "Use of Pesticides," of May 15, 1963, the following recommendation was made:

"The Panel recommends expanded research and evaluation by the Department of the Interior of the toxic effects of pesticides on wild vertebrates and invertebrates.

"The study of wildlife presents a unique opportunity to [redacted] the effects on the food chain of which each animal is a part, and to determine possible pathways through which accumulated and, in some cases, magnified pesticide residues can find their way directly or indirectly to wildlife and to man."

President Johnson in his recent message on natural beauty stated:

"Pesticides may affect living organisms wherever they occur.

"In order that we may better understand the effects of those compounds, I have included increased funds in the budget for use by the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare to increase their research efforts on pesticides so they can give special attention to the flow of pesticides through the environment; study the means by which pesticides break down and disappear in nature; and to keep a constant check on the level of pesticides in our water, air, soil, and food supply.

"I have asked the Secretary of the Interior to submit legislation to eliminate the ceiling on pesticide research."

The enclosed bill will accomplish this.

The act of August 1, 1958, as amended (16 U.S.C. 742d–1) directed the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a comprehensive and continuing program of study and research on the effects of pesticides on our Nation's fish and wildlife. The purpose of this program is to find amounts, percentages, and formulations of pesticidal chemicals which can be used safely, and which will prevent losses to this valuable resource. An annual appropriation of $280,000 was authorized to carry out this program. In 1959 this amount was increased to $2,565,000. This is the present ceiling on pesticide research.

Under this ceiling, the present program includes controlled laboratory studies of acute and chronic toxicities to selected species of wildlife and fish, development of new and improved methods of testing and analysis, the measurement of pesticide residues in tissues and organs of fish and wildlife specimens, and pre- and post-treatment observations of the effects of pest control chemicals upon the fish and wildlife environment.

The studies to date have revealed widespread presence of the residues of several widely used pesticidal chemicals in specimens of fish and wildlife collected from practically all parts of the country. Little is known, however, concerning the possible presence of many other present-day pesticidal materials or of their effects upon survival, reproduction, and growth of the fauna inhabiting land and water areas subjected to treatments or contamination by these substances. The acute and chronic effects resulting from exposure to combinations of such toxic agents are likewise largely unknown, although related studies have shown that one chemical may heighten the effect of another. While some of the residue levels of these chemicals are not considered dangerous to humans, they may be well above the levels tolerated by more sensitive forms of animal life, such as fish and shellfish. Further expansion of research is needed to increase knowledge of these effects; and where they are found to be harmful, to facilitate the discovery and development of substitute methods for necessary pest control that are more selective in their modes of action and do not persist in the environment for prolonged periods.

Enactment of the enclosed bill will permit such an expansion.

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

Sincerely yours,

FRANK R. BRIGGS,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

[From U.S. Department of the Interior]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT DEVELOPS NEW TESTS FOR PESTICIDES

The Department of the Interior announced today it has developed guidelines for testing the toxicity of new pesticides to fish and wildlife. The recommended procedures stem from experiments conducted by the Department under its intensified program to safeguard these important resources from poisoning.

Facts about toxicity are needed by manufacturers of pesticides to support their applications for Government registration of new pesticide compounds.

The Department's evaluation procedures, developed in cooperation with the National Agricultural Chemical Association, are similar to those used by research stations of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the Department.

The procedures are intended to produce information on the lethal and sublethal toxicity of pesticides to a variety of animal, fish, and shellfish species. They are not consid-

ered to be the sole means of testing for toxicity.

The guidelines recommend procedures for obtaining data on:

Lethal and sublethal toxicity to mammals, required by the Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Lethal toxicity to one species of waterfowl (mallard duck) and one of the following: bobwhite quail, ring-neck pheasant or coturnix (Japanese quail).

Lethal toxicity data on rainbow trout as the representative of coldwater fish; and one of these warm-water fish: bluegill, goldfish, or channel catfish.

Sublethal toxicity on the eastern oyster as representative of the marine mollusks. Lethal tests can not be made on the oyster because it closes its shell against a concentration of pesticides that would be fatal. The sublethal test shows the amount of reduction of shell growth caused by a pesticide.

The guidelines describe the feeding, housing, and temperature control for birds to be tested, the number of birds to be exposed to pesticides and their diets, and the periodic observations to be made. Similar recommendations are made for testing of fish.

The Department of the Interior said the Pesticides Review Staff of the Fish and Wildlife Service will assist manufacturers in evaluating any methods such producers devise to test pesticides.

AMENDMENT TO SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Small Business Act by repealing the so-called small business set-asides in Government construction. Construction set-asides have created a number of very serious problems in the building construction industry. Organized labor in building construction, as well as management groups with which I have consulted, strongly support my proposal.

In addition to repealing the small business set-aside in Government construction, my bill would set up a system of reports to the Small Business Administration from prime contractors on Government construction projects. Such reports could be used by the Congress in its continuing effort to improve the operation of the SBA.

Throughout our history, building construction on Government projects has been awarded on the basis of responsive competitive bidding. Without competitive bidding, the specter of political favor, the waste of taxpayers' money, and the prospect of inefficient and inadequate work performance will be with us again.

One of our best defenses against monopoly in Government construction is the responsive competitive bid. No matter how large or how small a man may be, he is not entitled to the job unless he can meet price competition in the construction industry.

In other small business set-asides, competitive bidding is used to determine price. After the price has been determined in this manner, the procurement item in question is set aside in order that small business men may have an opportunity to meet the competition of price as well as quality.

This has not been the case, however, in the operation of the small business set-aside in Government construction. Competent contractors sometimes are not permitted to bid. The result is that the Government does not always know what a fair price for these set-aside jobs might be.

The set-aside in Government construction also can be harmful to labor-management relations. Contracts in construction are arrived at before jobs are bid and begun. Because of this practice, stable labor relations in the industry depend upon agreements of a continuing nature between unions and established contractors. Construction set-aside, by definition, invites workers who are nonunion and not organized into Government construction. If they are not in business, or have not been in business as contractors, then they obviously have no incentive to become part of the labor-management fabric in this industry.

Although the defenders of the construction set-aside insist that small business contractors with Government contracts pay the prevailing wage provided by the Davis-Bacon Act, the fact remains that these set-aside contractors are not required to pay the so-called fringe benefits which exist in most other construction contracts.

In addition to this advantage, Mr. President, the set-aside contractors make very little contribution to the manpower training program of the construction industry. They do not participate in apprenticeship agreements and, therefore, are not carrying their share of the burden.

Finally, the small business set-aside in construction should be repealed because it simply has not worked. It is my understanding that the arrears and liquidation rate of loans by SBA to the construction industry are much higher than other types of loans. When this is compared with the average loss rate of all SBA loans of something less than 2 percent, it is apparent that we should take another look at this phase of the program. In our efforts to assist the small businessman and to promote the general welfare, we should not impose upon the building construction industry, a system of set-aside which is opposed by labor and management and which is detrimental to the best interest of the Federal Government.

I believe in the Small Business Administration and the efforts of the present administration to strengthen this agency. I do not believe, however, that the set-aside procedure should be applied in the building construction industry. I hope the majority of this body will agree.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until Thursday, April 1, for additional cosponsors.

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

The bill (S. 1624) to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance, repair, or construction; introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE [redacted]

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and ask unanimous consent it lie at the desk for cosponsors until next Thursday, April 1, 1965.

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

The bill (S. 1625) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax-exempt organizations to engage in certain activities for the purpose of influencing legislation directly relevant to the purposes which qualify such organizations for tax exemption, without losing certain benefits under that Code; introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACTS OF 1930 AND 1911

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the Tariff Act of 1911. This bill is identical to S. 2173 which I introduced during the 88th Congress and which was cosponsored by 17 other Senators.

The customs law under the Tariff Act of 1930 provides that no merchandise, baggage, or passengers arriving in the United States from any foreign port shall be unloaded on a Sunday, a holiday, or at night, except under a special license granted by the collector of customs. Before any such license is granted, however, the collector requires that the person or persons making the request agree to pay the compensation of customs officers assigned to duty on Sunday, a holiday, or at night. There is a provision in the present act which exempts highway vehicles and ferries from these overtime charges. Thus, the full burden of these charges falls upon the private aircraft operator as well as commercial airlines, steamship, and railroad lines.

I have always been at somewhat of a loss to understand why people traveling by automobile, ferry, or even on foot, receive regular customs service 24 hours of every day but people who travel by private or commercial aircraft, steamship and railroad must pay sometimes enormous overtime charges on weekends, holidays and after 5 p.m. The commercial air, water, and rail companies pass this cost along to their passengers in the general fare and thus, we are often unaware of such charges when traveling on these facilities. But the private pilot, and there are thousands of them, must dig these charges out of his pocket each time he has the misfortune of returning to the country on weekends, holidays, or after 5 p.m.

These charges can sometimes be quite high. Quoting from a letter I received from the Commissioner of Customs:

The cost of overtime services depends upon the salary of the customs officer performing

the service. On Sundays and holidays this will equal 2 days' pay regardless of the time required up to 8 hours.

According to figures supplied to me by the FAA, a typical GS–9 inspector, whose straight time rate is $3.54 per hour, receives $28.32 for 1 hour of call back overtime work between 7 and 8 p.m. For 1 hour of work between 10 p.m. and 11 p.m., this employee receives $42.48. He can receive up to $70.80 for 6 hours of overtime work in the course of 1 night. For 1 hour of work on a Sunday or holiday, this same GS–9 inspector receives $56.64. In fact, I am told by reliable sources that many customs inspectors receive overtime pay for extra inspections that equal or exceed their annual base pay.

The Bureau of Customs justifies these extra customs charges on the ground that people traveling by private aircraft, commercial airline, steamship, or railroad are not specifically exempt persons; that it has no discretionary authority in the application of the statute; that its job is to enforce expressed congressional intent. The legislative history behind the Tariff Act of 1930, however, shows no congressional intent to require extra customs charges for people traveling by private and commercial airline, steamship, or railroad. On the contrary, the legislative history is such that the possible exemption of such people was not even considered by Congress. These overtime laws were enacted in an era when the small aircraft's future as a common means of transportation was unknown. They were enacted in an era when the future significance of transportation and foreign commerce to our Nation's economy probably was not fully visualized. In fact, current customs overtime requirements are based on a statute which is over 50 years old. Today, when more and more people are flying and utilizing small aircraft as a common means of transportation; when approximately 80 percent of today's total aviation travel in the United States is conducted by private aircraft; and when more and more people are using commercial airlines, steamships, and railroads for transportation and foreign commerce, it seems to me the law should be amended to meet the need for full-time inspection services without special charges. The use of these modes of travel and commerce will undoubtedly increase as time goes by, and it seems to me that it is inequitable to require only one group to pay for the cost of necessary governmental services.

One of the basic purposes of the existing tariff law was to discourage foreign commerce transactions at other than the so-called regular 8-to-5 business hours then established, and because inspection personnel work schedules could not be predicted in view of the unpredictable operating schedules of transportation companies then in operation. Our trade policies, public service demands, and transportation systems, techniques, and schedules have changed in the last 50 years.

Many public service functions of both private industry and our Government are now required 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. In light of what I have said, this is particularly true with regard to private aircraft travel and the transportation business. Although the 40-hour week is the general rule for employees of both private industry and Government, both have found it better and desirable to rotate and schedule employees on work shifts covering days, nights, weekends, and holidays. We have all seen such scheduling work, and our country has prospered under it.

Presently, the Bureau of Customs is closed down 60 days a year and at night in many cases unless private parties enter into labor contracts with Government custom employees for what is considered a special service. This condition is allowed by laws which assume that private aviation travel and our international transportation system can likewise shut down and stop on Sundays, holidays, or at night. It is inferred from these laws that our Government has no public service obligations and duties with respect to private aviation travel or foreign commerce except during so-called regular business hours, Monday through Friday. The truth of it is that the public services which the Bureau of Customs provides are necessary 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for the benefit of the people returning to the United States by private aircraft, commercial airline, steamship, or railroad, as well as by other modes of transportation. This inspection service is performed in the national interest and not in the interest of one portion of the public. We are all affected by foreign travel and commerce. It seems fair that we should all bear such an inspection expense just as we do for returns to the United States by automobile, ferry, or by foot on a Sunday, a holiday, or at night. It seems to me that remedial legislation has been long overdue.

The President has recently announced his intention to submit to Congress a major plan of reorganization of the Bureau of Customs. The legislation that I am introducing is most timely and would seem to be a logical subject for inquiry in connection with such a reorganization. A survey group recently issued a report to the Secretary of the Treasury. The report itself is quite lengthy but the survey group did briefly consider the Customs overtime laws. A brief history of these laws is contained on pages AV–13, 14, and 15 of their report, and I ask unanimous consent that this portion of the report may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BRIEF HISTORY OF CUSTOMS OVERTIME LAWS

The present customs overtime statutes are section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, 36 Stat. 901, as amended by the act of February 7, 1920, 41 Stat. 402 (19 U.S.C. 261, 267) and section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1451).

Section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, supra, provided that "the Secretary of the Treasury shall fix a reasonable rate of extra compensation for night services of inspectors, storekeepers, weighers, and other customs officers and employees in connection with the lading or unlading of cargo at night, or the lading at night of cargo or merchandise for transportation in bond or for exportation in bond, or for the exportation with benefit of drawback, but such rate of compensation shall not exceed an amount equal to double the rate of compensation allowed to each such officer or employee for like services rendered by day, the said extra compensation to be paid by the master, owner, agent, or consignee of such vessel or other conveyance, whenever such special license or permit for immediate lading or for unlading at night or on Sundays or holidays shall be granted, to the collector of customs, who shall pay the same to the several customs officers and employees entitled thereto according to the rates fixed therefor by the Secretary of the Treasury." The section also provided for the payment of such extra compensation to boarding officers.

The act of February 7, 1920, supra, amended section 5 of the 1911 act to provide that the rates of extra compensation shall be fixed "on the basis of one-half day's pay for each 2 hours or fraction thereof of at least 1 hour that the overtime extends beyond 5 o'clock postmeridian (but not to exceed two and one-half day's pay for the full period from 5 o'clock postmeridian to 8 o'clock antemeridian), and two additional days' pay for Sunday or holiday duty." The amendment made some other changes including substitution of "overtime services" for "night services", using the phrase "required to remain on duty" between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m., and providing that extra compensation shall be paid "if such officers or employees have been ordered to report for duty and have so reported, whether the actual lading, unlading, receiving, delivery or examination takes place or not." For discussion of the 1920 amendment see (1919) 59 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 640; (1920) H. Rept. No. 567, 66th Cong. 2d sess.; (1920) 59 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2171.

The first, second, third, and fourth sections of the act of February 13, 1911, supra, providing for special licenses to lade or unlade cargo of vessels at night and related matters, were repealed by section 643, Tariff Act of 1922, which provided, in sections 450, 451, and 452, for special licenses to lade and unlade upon the giving of a bond conditioned, among other things, upon the payment of overtime compensation in accordance with section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, supra. Sections 450, 451, and 452, of the Tariff Act of 1930, were similar to the corresponding sections of the 1922 Tariff Act, except that the new section 451 contained additional provisions for assigning customs officers and employees upon request of the master, owner, or agent of a vessel. Section 451 of the 1930 act was amended by section 9 of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938, to provide that "Upon request made by the owner, master, or person in charge of a vessel or vehicle, or by or on behalf of the owner or consignee of any merchandise or baggage" for overtime services, officers or employees will be assigned to perform "any such services which may lawfully be performed by them during regular hours of business." Thus the coverage of the overtime provisions were extended so as not to be limited to services in connection with the lading or unlading of vessels.

The term "day's pay" in the above-mentioned 1920 amendment was the subject of a decision by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *Meyer* v. *Morgenthau* (1941) 122 Fed. (2d) 216. The Treasury Department had provided (in Treasury Decision 49669) that the daily rate of pay for overtime services should be the gross daily rate of regular compensation, except that when such gross daily rate of regular compensation was less than $5 or more than $8, the daily rate of extra compensation should be $5 or $8, as the case might be. The court held that the

term "day's pay" as used in the statute meant a day's pay at the employees regular rate of pay, and that the Treasury regulation was, therefore, invalid.

The above-mentioned provision of section 9 of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938, amending section 451, Tariff Act of 1930, also provided that "Nothing in this section shall be construed to impair the existing authority of the Treasury Department to assign Customs officers or employees to regular tours of duty at nights or on Sundays or holidays when such assignments are in the public interest." This related to the practice of assigning customs employees to regular tours of duty without extra compensation at night and on Sundays and holidays at border crossings (and some other places) where customs service was required at all hours of the day and night during the 7 days of the week. This practice was held by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States* v. *Myers* (1944) 320 U.S. 561 and 321 U.S. 750, to be valid as to night services on weekdays but invalid as to Sunday and holiday services. The Court held that extra compensation under the 1911 act, as amended by the 1920 act, must be paid for all services within its purview performed at any time during the 24 hours of a Sunday or holiday.

After the decision in *United States* v. *Myers, supra,* section 451, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1451), was further amended by the act of June 3, 1944, 58 Stat. 269, to exempt the owners, operators, or agents of highway vehicles, bridges, tunnels, or ferries from reimbursing the Government for extra compensation of customs employees for services performed at these facilities.

Another important court decision on the customs overtime laws was the decision of the Court of Claims in *O'Rourke* v. *United States* (1947) 109 Ct. Cls. 33. In that case, the court held that extra compensation under the 1911 act, as amended, was payable for inspectional services performed at free bridges and highways as well as for services at toll facilities. There were also a number of other questions decided in the case.

The current customs regulation on extra compensation under the customs overtime laws is section 24.16 of the customs regulations of 1943 (19 CFR 24.16), as amended. One provision of that regulation which has been the subject of considerable discussion is the provision, in certain situations, for compensable time in addition to the time spent at the place of the overtime assignment. This provision (in paragraph (g), as amended by T.D. 52903) is supported by the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury in the 1911 act, as amended, to fix reasonable rates of overtime compensation. In this connection, reference is made to the above mentioned decision in the case of *Meyer* v. *Morgenthau,* 122 Fed. (2d) 216, in which the court said that "the fixing of pay for overtime services includes two elements; the definition or measurement of the 'overtime service,' and the definition of the pay for such services. The Secretary, has, and exercises, a considerable discretion in regard to the first element * * *."

This memorandum does not purport to mention every statute that has ever been passed or every court decision on customs overtime. Some old statutes prior to the act of February 13, 1911, and a few court decisions on particular points, which would not seem to be of interest in connection with the present consideration of the overtime question, are omitted.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the survey report also discussed several recommendations in this regard made by the O'Connel citizens task force report. However, this was not any kind of a study in depth. The surface was just barely scratched.

Because the subject of this bill is a revenue matter, it will undoubtedly be referred to the Senate Finance Committee. Since this is a matter which vitally affects commerce, I intend to ask the Senate Commerce Committee to conduct a study and investigation into the entire matter so that we may have a complete record.

Mr. President, this is an important piece of legislation and would fit nicely into any proposed reorganization of the Bureau of Customs. It attracted widespread support during the last Congress not only among Senators but in many segments of industry as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk until the close of business on April 1, 1965, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will lie on the desk until the close of business on April 1, 1965, as requested.

The bill (S. 1628) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the act of February 13, 1911, to eliminate those provisions which require payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN CLARK COUNTY, NEV., TO FRANCIS W. THORNE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Clark County, Nev., to Francis W. Thorne.

Mr. Thorne and his predecessors in interest have occupied this particular 20 acres in southern Nevada for over 30 years under the apparent mistaken premise that a patent had been issued by the United States and that they were secure in their ownership of the property.

Recent investigations now confirm that title still vests in the Government.

This bill provides for the conveyance of the property to Mr. Thorne, at fair market value plus such sums as may be determined by the Secretary to reimburse the United States for the administrative conveyance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1631) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Clark County, Nev., to Francis W. Thorne, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REGULATION OF CERTAIN FIREARMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as a member of the District of Columbia Committee, I rise to introduce an item of legislation to which I attach a good deal of importance. It is a pistol regulation bill for the District of Columbia.

This bill is designed to keep deadly weapons out of the hands of irresponsible persons, and would prevent such persons from purchasing pistols. In addition, it would require that firearms of 12 inches or less be registered with the police.

This bill is designed to implement a part of the President's message on the District of Columbia.

This bill is designed to protect the overwhelming majority of law-abiding citizens of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, this bill is designed to save lives.

The bill was drafted by the District of Columbia Commissioners, with the able assistance of Mr. David Acheson, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia. I have changed section 104, however, to provide that the first offense shall be a misdemeanor, and any subsequent offense a felony. The bill would not prohibit responsible persons from possessing handguns in their homes and places of business. The bill would simply require that persons owning pistols register them with the police. Criminal penalties are provided for violation of the registration provisions.

In addition, penalties for illegally carrying concealed weapons, and for possessing such prohibited weapons as sawed-off shotguns and machineguns, would be increased.

These provisions, together with the lengthening of the period of investigating prospective purchasers of pistols, will constitute important weapons in our fight against crime and lawlessness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1632) to require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SPOT IMPROVEMENTS FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the improvement of highway safety is a cause with which I am deeply concerned. Extension of the Interstate Highway System from 41,00 to 60,000 miles, as authorized in my bill S. 1272, is one means to this end. Adoption for use by the public of the new GSA standards for automobile construction, as provided in Senator NELSON'S bill, S. 1251, which I have cosponsored, is another approach. I expect in the near future to introduce proposed legislation to allow a speedup in the construction of the interstate highway system, removing the restrictions which keep it on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Today, as one more tool in the war against traffic accidents, I am presenting a bill to provide Federal funds for spot improvement of high-accident areas on the federally assisted primary, secondary and urban road systems, the so-called ABC system, throughout the Nation. Before describing the fairly simple mechanism by which this bill would

cut the terrible traffic toll, I wish to sketch in the background and demonstrate the need for this approach.

In an interview published in U.S. News & World Report under date of March 1, the noted traffic engineer, Wilbur S. Smith, was asked:

Are streets and highways, themselves, causing some of the accident problems?

Mr. Smith, who headed the executive committee of the National Academy of Sciences' Highway Research Board in 1964, replied:

To some extent, yes, though not as much as the human element. We know of places where accidents occur repeatedly—where the curves are too sharp or intersections are too hazardous or visibility is obstructed, and so on. Defects of this kind can be corrected through simple engineering, and save many lives. My own feeling is that we should spend more money on these changes, even if we have to spend less on building new roads.

The Bureau of Public Roads has not been unaware of this need, and neither has the President. In a letter to Secretary Hodges just 1 year ago, on March 23, 1964, President Johnson called for encouragement and assistance to State and local governments in the development of priority safety programs, giving special attention to hazards on highways with high accident experience.

Such a program, within the confines of the present Federal aid to highways on the 50–50 matching basis applied to ABC roads, and using highway trust fund resources, was encouraged by the Bureau of Public Roads, which described the types of projects to be undertaken in a memorandum issued last May to its regional and division engineers, and to State highway departments. In order that the type of projects I am discussing may be clear, following are some of the typical projects specified in a Bureau of Public Roads release of May 4, 1964:

Widening of narrow traffic lanes;

Construction of stable shoulders of adequate width, or reconstruction of existing shoulders to provide additional width;

Reconstruction to increase sight distances on curves;

Widening of narrow bridges or other structures;

Installation of protective devices at railroad crossings;

Removal of roadside curbs and fixed obstructions;

Construction of fencing; and

Construction of service roads, entrances and exists, curbs, and similar facilities to regulate traffic.

In a report issued last December, the Bureau of Public Roads pointed to some of the achievements such a program can bring. A study of spot improvements of this kind by the Virginia Department of Highways showed that 11 minor projects to correct higher-than-average accident locations reduced accidents by 66 percent and fatalities from 13 to only 1 in a comparable period of time. The total investment of only $43,000 resulted in cutting accident costs—and no price can be set on fatalities and injuries—by $153,000.

In California, 169 minor improvement projects costing an average of $13,000 each, reduced accidents by 32 percent in the face of increased traffic volume.

Since the total number of Federal-aid safety projects under the existing program up to January 1 of this year totaled on 153 in all, scattered over 32 States and the District of Columbia, it is obvious that States such as California have been proceeding on their own. But the fact that in the months which had elapsed since the Bureau of Public Roads sought to stimulate the program, only 153 projects were begun, shows that there is not enough incentive to really make a strong effort in the States. Money that has to be used for spot improvements must be taken from funds which would otherwise be building new roads. A new highway project is more highly visible. Widening a bridge, or installing a special curb-divided left turn lane, may be dramatic in the cutting of accidents, but the results do not show to the public so readily.

Under the existing program, as I have said, there is 50 percent Federal participation in the ABC system—which is 70 percent primary or urban and 30 percent rural in character. But there is no real incentive to spur State and local road authorities toward applying the funds to spot improvements.

My bill will give that incentive. First, it will provide authorization of up to $100 million for this specific purpose, over and beyond the funds already available from the "dedicated" highway trust funds, so that the sum provided will be over and beyond what is already available. It will give a further incentive by providing a more generous Federal share, using the same manner of apportionment to the States but making the Federal funds available for up to 70 percent of the spot-improvement costs rather than restricting them to 50 percent. It specifies that "such projects shall be given priority in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary."

In these ways, we will be making a much stronger attack on the goal, placing first emphasis upon the most dangerous spots, and applying our existing, and quite adequate, engineering skill to the obliteration of dangers which have been ignored despite accident frequency in these various locations.

With a record high of 47,800 persons killed on our streets and highways last year, with 1,600,000 persons injured, with an economic loss estimated at $7 billion, we must do more to meet the need. The $100 million authorized from the general Treasury by my bill will be repaid manyfold by the sheer economics involved in accident cutting, not to mention the savings in lives and crippling and distress. It is scarcely less than criminal to do less than we know how with highway engineering to cut this terrible toll.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may lie on the table for 1 week in order that those who desire may join me in cosponsoring the legislation. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the table for 1 week as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1633) to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to authorize a program to improve safety on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems of highways, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1633

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, is amended by inserting at the end of chapter 1 a new section as follows:

"§ 135. ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR PRIMARY, SECONDARY, AND URBAN SYSTEMS TO ADD SAFETY FEATURES.

"(a) In addition to other funds authorized for the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $100,000,000 which shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this title for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems, including extensions into urban areas, which are approved by the Secretary as adding useful safety features to existing highways in such systems. Such projects shall be given priority in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary.

"(b) The amount appropriated for any fiscal year for the purposes of this section shall be apportioned among the States, one-third in the manner provided in section 104(b)(1), one-third in the manner provided in section 104(b)(2), and one-third in the manner provided in section 104(b)(3). A State's apportionment pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall be available during such year and the succeeding fiscal year for paying not more than 70 per centum of the costs of projects authorized in this section."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"§ 135. Additional program for primary, secondary, and urban systems to add safety features."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Engineered Safety," written by Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator in the Bureau of Public Roads, which was published in the August 1964, issue of the American Road Builder. The illustrations of spot improvement work given there by Mr. Whitton show very clearly the values of this approach and the necessity for a modest investment in this kind of work.

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

ENGINEERED SAFETY

(By Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads)

President Johnson's call for an accelerated attack on traffic accidents through the Federal aid highway programs has focused attention on the role of engineering and construction in highway safety. The President called for "priority safety programs giving special

attention to hazards on highways with high-accident experience."

In response to the President's directive, the Bureau of Public Roads is urging State highway departments to apply a substantial portion of their available Federal aid primary and secondary road and urban extension funds toward spot improvement projects which would eliminate such accident-inducing hazards.

Measurable reductions in accidents and fatalities at given locations have resulted from such improvements in the past. Further, there is good reason to believe that a redoubled effort to correct these hazardous conditions throughout the country will contribute significantly to reducing the Nation's tragic traffic toll. The fact that 43,400 Americans lost their lives in traffic accidents last year, and that these accidents cost more than the total annual public investment in highway construction, certainly demands we apply our engineering know-how toward bringing this problem under control.

Engineers recognize that highway transportation and traffic safety involve a system comprised of the driver, the vehicle and the roadway and its environment. Therefore, the sound approach to traffic safety is a systems approach which takes into account these elements. Unfortunately, there has not been sufficient public recognition of this concept. There has, instead, been a general tendency to blame nearly all accidents on the driver. The resulting overemphasis on the driver in various safety programs has diverted attention and energy from the very real progress which can be realized through building safety into our roads and streets.

The contribution that engineers and road builders can and do make is entirely consistent with the systems approach to traffic safety. Well-designed highways reduce the demands placed on the driver and the vehicle, and they provide an added margin for errors or malfunctions in these elements of the system.

The outstanding example today of built-in safety is the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. Studies of completed portions of the Interstate System have shown a fatality rate of 2.8 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles, compared with a rate of 9.7 on older highways in the same traffic corridors. The Bureau of Public Roads estimates that the interstate will save 3,500 lives this year alone, and 8,000 lives a year when it is completed in 1972.

With the entire 41,000-mile network in operation, it will carry 20 percent of the total traffic. This still leaves 80 percent to be handled by all other roads and streets, most of which are not as safe as the interstate. Hopefully, normal long-range construction improvements will eventually increase their safety as well as their adequacy to meet the growing demands of our transportation system. The prospect of traffic tolls in 1964 or 1965 being even higher than those in 1963 has created an urgency for immediate action, however. Accordingly, the Bureau of Public Roads is asking that spot improvements for safety be given a special priority. This priority would move them to construction well in advance of the time they would otherwise be scheduled on the basis of general route improvement.

In considering what can be done to make our older roads safer, it is well to look at the design features of the Interstate Highway System. Obviously, however, not all roads can or should be freeways built to interstate standards. Design features responsible for the fine safety record of the interstate include control of access, divided lane roadways, wide lanes, easy curves and grades, and long-sight distances. Headon crashes, opposite direction sideswipes, and angle and pedestrian collisions are virtually eliminated by such features.

The relationship of these and other roadway elements to traffic accidents has been documented in various engineering studies. A compilation of this research was published last year under the title "Traffic Control and Roadway Elements," by the Automotive Safety Foundation, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads. These and other studies indicate the results that can be obtained from spot improvements, as the following examples illustrate.

Lane widening: A study of 240 miles of highway sections in Illinois, which had been widened from 18 to 22 feet, showed reductions in accident rates ranging from 21.5 percent for low volume roads to 46.6 percent for higher volume roads.

Shoulder widening: In Virginia, the shoulders on a 15-mile section, which had varied from 1 to 4 feet in width, were widened to a uniform width of 6 feet, 4 feet of which was surface treated. In the 2 years prior to widening there were 102 accidents; in the 2 years following, only 69. The accident rates per million vehicle-miles were 2.76 and 1.86 for the two periods.

Resurfacing: In Detroit, brick-paved Michigan Avenue at its intersection with Clark Street was slippery when wet. In the year before it was resurfaced there were 57 accidents involving Michigan Avenue traffic at the intersection; in the first year after, only 18. The number of accidents occurring while the surface was wet dropped from 32 to 8. The second year after resurfacing there were 23 accidents, only 7 of which occurred on wet pavement.

Clear roadside: In four Virginia counties 25 percent of the fixed-object accidents involved trees. A program was begun to remove all trees within 15 feet of the roadway. After the program had been underway for some time, a comparison was made of accidents before and after. The number of accidents involving trees had dropped from 28 to 17; the number of persons killed and injured had dropped from 37 to 12. During this period, the number of other types of accidents remained nearly constant. Similar safety improvements include the removal of utility poles, culvert headwalls too close to the pavement, roadside curbs, and other fixed obstructions, and the flattening of side slopes to provide a clear recovery area of vehicles out of control.

Curves and grades: When 7 curves in California were realined to increase the radius, injury accident rates dropped 84 percent. Where reconstruction of long grades is not feasible, the installation of truck-climbing lanes can minimize dangerous passing situations and rearend collisions.

Curve signing: A resigning program for all curves in Kansas included larger signs placed farther in advance of the curve, and the use of "safe speed" indications. In the year before resigning, there were 49 fatalities on curves; in the year following, 28.

Bridge and overpass widening: Research by the Bureau of Public Roads and the National Safety Council reveals a significant relationship between bridge width and safety. It shows that where structure width was 1 foot or more narrower than the approach width, the accident rate was 100 accidents per 100 million vehicle-miles. Where the structure was up to 5 feet wider than the approach the rate was 58, and where the structure was 5 or more feet wider the rate was only 12.

Intersections: In Portland, Oreg., the former Slavin Road intersection on Barbur Boulevard, a major arterial, with access at grade and traffic light control, averaged 120 accidents and 60 injuries a year. After installation of a grade-separation structure with freeway-type access, accidents dropped to 4 and injuries to 2 a year, a reduction of 96 percent, even though average daily traffic counts increased from 11,000 to 13,000.

This is a dramatic, but partial, list of what can be accomplished for traffic safety through engineering. The list also includes protective devices at railroad crossings, medians and dividers, channelized intersections, construction of service roads, entrances and exits (and similar facilities to regulate traffic), proper use of guardrails, guideposts, and delineators, edge marking and highway lighting.

Special mention should be made of uniform traffic controls and signs. Improper or missing traffic control devices can confuse or mislead the motorists and create accident hazards. The Bureau of Public Roads accordingly is striving to achieve nationwide uniformity of such signs, signals, and markings on Federal aid highways by the end of 1966.

The response of the State highway departments to the accelerated safety improvement program indicates their concern over the accident problem and their desire to make safety a primary objective in highway construction and improvements. Their plans for eliminating hazardous conditions will pay lasting dividends in lives saved and accidents prevented, even if the results do not become apparent in the remainder of this year.

Certainly, much has been done and much has been learned about making our roads and streets safer. With this experience we can meet the challenge now before us. One thing is sure: the opportunity for road builders to apply their skills for the benefit of all Americans was never greater.

MARKING OF STEEL CONTAINERS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I offer again today for myself and Senators SCOTT, RANDOLPH, MOSS, DOMINICK, and LAUSCHE, a bill to insure the identification of steel shipping containers manufactured from imported steel. This Steel Shipping Container Identification Act is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman WILLARD CURTIN, who was among those who introduced parallel legislation there last year. It has only minor changes from the bill which I introduced on April 22, 1963, and which was cosponsored by nearly a dozen of my colleagues.

This bill would prohibit the introduction into commerce of any shipping container, as defined in the bill, manufactured in the United States chiefly from imported steel, unless the container is marked with the name of the country of origin of the steel. It would permit buyers of steel shipping containers—defined in the bill as "all steel drums and pails used for shipping products to wholesale or retail distributors or to commercial users"—to know when imported steel is used in their manufacture. More important, it would promote the use of steel produced in this country, but it would do so without any forbidding of imports.

The House bill of last session, H.R. 5673, received hearings in the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, which heard on November 9, 1963, statements of support from representatives of the Steel Shipping Container Institute, the United Steelworkers of America, and others. On July 9, 1964, the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce issued a favorable report—House Report 1552, 88th Congress—and the bill was passed by the House of Representatives on August 12, 1964. I trust that this legislation may secure passage in

both Houses of the Congress in this session.

Iron and steel is the most basic production industry of the Nation, as we are all aware. In the States of Indiana and Pennsylvania this industry provides nearly a quarter of a million jobs. It is vital to protect these jobs and those of other steelworkers throughout the Nation.

It is probably a little-known fact outside the steel industry that the greatest use of sheet steel outside of the automotive industry is in the manufacture of shipping containers. For a number of years the steel shipping container manufacturing industry has been severely depressed, operating substantially below full capacity. Profit margins are at a minimum and price competition is severe. Companies using foreign steel in container manufacture enjoy a significant cost differential. Because of these conditions, the smaller companies, although they might prefer domestic steel, find themselves compelled to purchase foreign steel. This trend has been accelerating, leading to a shrinkage in the market for the domestic steel industry.

The inroads of these imports may be seen by the fact that imported steel sheets in 1961 totaled 57,900 tons. In 1962 the figure more than tripled to 172,900 tons. It tripled again in 1963, the year my previous bill was introduced, reaching 527,400 tons. Estimates for last year are that the tonnage of imported steel sheets again nearly doubled, to about 1,025,000 tons.

Under existing law, shipping containers manufactured outside the United States, like other finished products, must be marked as to country of origin. Sheet steel imported into the United States must likewise be marked. But when the marked sheet steel is further processed into another product, such as a steel shipping container, there is no requirement that it be marked with the name of the country of origin of the steel.

The bill I am offering requires that the container must have embossed on the top head, in letters at least one-quarter inch high, the legend, "Steel in this container made in ———," designating the country of origin. Each steel container manufacturer must maintain records showing the source of steel used in its manufacture. Enforcement, including the use of criminal sanctions involving fines up to $5,000 and imprisonment up to 1 year, would be under the Federal Trade Commission.

This bill, as I have noted, does not prohibit importation of steel sheets. It does not affect the tariff laws. It is concerned only with domestic commerce under the law. But if the requirement of publicizing the origin of the steel involved discourages the use of imports and the purchase of sheet steel from domestic manufacturers instead, it will not only help our own jobs and companies, but it will also have a helpful effect on our balance-of-payments problem.

In order that other Members may have the opportunity to join Senator SCOTT and myself in sponsoring the bill, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the table for 1 week and that the text of the bill may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1634) to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1634

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Steel Shipping Container Identification Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other form of business enterprise.

(b) The term "commerce" means commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, or between two points in the same State but through any point outside thereof, or in any possession of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or between any such possession and another, or between any such possession and any State or foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State, possession of the United States, or foreign nation.

(c) The term "State" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(d) The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(e) The term "shipping container" shall mean all steel drums and pails used for shipping products as defined by the Department of Commerce:

(1) Drum: Any single wall cylindrical or bilged container having a capacity of over twelve gallons to one hundred and ten gallons, inclusive, constructed of steel sheet and inclusive of all gages.

(2) Pail: Any steel shipping package with or without bail and handle having a capacity of one gallon to twelve gallons, inclusive, constructed of steel sheet twenty-nine gage or heavier.

MARKING OF STEEL SHIPPING CONTAINERS

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act for any manufacturer of steel shipping containers to introduce any such container into commerce whenever such container is manufactured in the United States in whole or in chief value from steel made outside the United States, unless such container bears embossed on the top head of the container in letters not less than one-fourth of an inch in height the legend "Steel in this container made in ———"; with the blank space being filled with the name of the foreign country in which such steel was made.

(b) It shall be unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act for any person to deface, destroy, remove, alter, cover, obscure, or obliterate any mark placed on a steel shipping container pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, if the purpose of defacing, destroying, removing, altering, covering, obscuring, or obliterating such mark is to hinder or prevent other persons from obtaining the information given by such mark.

RECORDS

SEC. 4. (a) Every manufacturer of steel shipping containers shall maintain proper records showing the origin of the steel used in all steel shipping containers made by him, and shall preserve such records for at least three years.

(b) The neglect or refusal to maintain or preserve the records required by this section is unlawful, and any person neglecting or refusing to maintain such records shall be guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, this Act shall be enforced by the Commission under rules, regulations, and procedures authorized for in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(b) The Commission shall prevent any person from violating the provisions of this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act; and any such person violating the provisions of this Act shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act as though the applicable terms and provisions of such Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(c) The Commission is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purposes of administration and enforcement of this Act.

(d) The Commission is authorized to cause inspections, analyses, tests and examinations to be made of any steel shipping container subject to this Act.

CRIMINAL PENALTY

SEC. 6. (a) Whoever willfully violates sections 3 or 4 of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both, in the discretion of the court: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall limit any other provision of this Act.

(b) If the Commission has reason to believe that any person has violated sections 3 or 4 of this Act the Commission may certify all pertinent facts to the Attorney General and if the Attorney General concurs, he shall cause appropriate proceedings to be brought for the enforcement of this Act against such person.

APPLICATION OF OTHER LAWS

SEC. 7. The purposes of this Act shall be held to be in addition to, and not in substitution for or limitation of, the provisions of any other Act of Congress.

SEC. 8. This Act shall take effect ——— after the date of its enactment.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO HELP STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the production of iron and steel provides over a million and a quarter jobs in the United States. Unfair competition, predatory pricing, and outright dumping of foreign steel constitute a threat to those jobs and to the overall economy of our Nation.

In 1961, some 57,900 tons of steel sheets were imported into the United States.

In 1962, this tonnage climbed to 172,900.

In 1963, the amount grew to 527,400 tons, and in 1964 an estimated 1,025,000

tons of steel sheets were imported from foreign steel producers.

Shipping containers, such as drums and pails, are second only to automobiles in the usage of steel sheets. I believe that the purchasers of these containers have a right to know whether or not they are helping to create and maintain jobs for Americans, and improve our balance-of-payments position, or to create jobs for foreign workers and damage our already troubled balance-of-payments position.

That is why I have today cosponsored legislation introduced by Senator HARTKE to require U.S. manufacturers of steel containers, using in whole or in chief value steel made outside this country, to label their products with the country of the steel's origin.

This bill would require each such container to have embossed on its top, in letters not less than one-fourth of an inch in height, the legend "Steel in this container made in ———", the blank space being filled with the country of origin.

Passage of this legislation would in no way limit the freedom of choice of the manufacturer or the user. It is not punitive. It does not ask special favors, nor does it increase duties or tariff protection. But it would enable the user to make a choice between American steel and foreign steel when he purchases steel containers.

A BILL TO REQUIRE ANNUAL APPROVAL BY THE CONGRESS OF AGGREGATE AMOUNTS OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATIONS CONTAINED IN GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for myself and Senators BENNETT, BYRD of Virginia, CURTIS, DOMINICK, FANNIN, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, JORDAN of Idaho, MILLER, MORTON, PROUTY, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SIMPSON, THURMOND, and WILLIAMS of Delaware, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require annual approval by the Congress of aggregate amounts of expenditure authorizations contained in general appropriation acts. I ask that the bill be printed at the end of my remarks and that it be held at the desk for 1 week so that others may cosponsor it if they wish to do so.

The mechanics of the procedure contained in the bill which I introduce would be that the Congress would continue to break down the budget request into separate appropriation bills, and pass on it in some detail in those separate bills. Then, after all of the separate general appropriation bills for the year had been passed, Congress would be required to pass a joint resolution approving the total aggregate amount contained in those separate bills before the money would be available for expenditure. Thus, we would review not only the merits of individual programs, but the total amount of new funds to be provided as against expected total income for the fiscal year.

Actually, Mr. President, sizable sums which the Congress acts on would be left outside the scope of this bill, for practical reasons. Appropriations of trust funds would not be covered, nor would retirement of debt. Deficiency and supplemental bills would also be outside this bill's coverage, simply because it would not be practical to hold up the whole appropriations process until we were assured that no further funds would be required in any program. The "continuing resolution" under which the various agencies continue to function until the appropriations procedure is completed would also be excluded from the bill's coverage.

But the bill would at least cover the bulk of our appropriations, and would oblige us to consider the budget requests in relation to anticipated income for the year. Even more importantly, it would enable us to review our action on the earlier passed bills in light of what action we take on later bills. I think it would be informative both to the Congress and to the citizens of the United States.

The procedure provided is somewhat similar to that followed in my State of Colorado, and in several other States. The Colorado Legislature is required to look at its total appropriation because the State constitution prohibits appropriations in excess of receipts from taxes. I recognize that the Federal Government does not have this kind of limitation imposed on it, but I believe that the Congress should have both the opportunity and the obligation to make that kind of comparison and to decide whether the total figure approved in the separate bills is really what we want to spend in light of expected income, the state of the economy, and any other relevant factors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 1635) to require annual approval by the Congress of aggregate amounts of expenditure authorizations contained in general appropriation acts, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That unless otherwise expressly provided therein, no expenditure authorization contained in a general appropriation act for any fiscal year shall become effective until there shall have been enacted—

(1) all other general appropriation acts for such fiscal year; and

(2) a joint resolution containing a statement of the aggregate amount of expenditure authorizations for such fiscal year contained in all such general appropriation acts, including any amendments thereto, and a statement to the effect that the Congress approves the expenditure of such aggregate amount.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "expenditure authorization" means an appropriation, contract authorization, authorization to spend from public or corporate debt receipts, limitation on expenditures authorized to be incurred against revolving funds or funds of Government corporations, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriation, reauthorization, or any other authorization to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States, but does not include an appropriation of trust funds or a transaction involving public debt retirement.

(2) The term "general appropriation act" does not include a deficiency or supplemental appropriation act, or an act or joint resolution providing temporary expenditure authorizations pending enactment of a regular appropriation act.

SEC. 3. This Act shall be effective with respect to general appropriation acts for fiscal year 1966 and subsequent fiscal years.

AMERICAN LEGION JUNIOR BASEBALL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, we South Dakotans are proud of the fact that Milbank, S. Dak., is the birthplace of American Legion junior baseball. A monument in Milbank commemorates the inception of this worthy program in 1925.

While others are talking about physical fitness and combatants for juvenile delinquency, the American Legion for 40 years has offered a program which provides outstanding opportunities to acquire physical fitness, to develop personal responsibility and good citizenship, to learn the value of teamwork and mutual cooperation, as well as to acquire individual proficiency and an opportunity to advance to a professional career in the sport of baseball. More than 15 million youths of 18 years of age and under have participated. South Dakota has been a leader in this activity ever since the idea was originated out in Milbank in 1925.

This year, as junior league baseball marks its 40th anniversary, the little world series will be played in its birthplace, South Dakota. The Sidney L. Smith Post 24 in Aberdeen will serve as host during the week beginning August 31. In observance of this event, the South Dakota Legislature recently adopted a resolution requesting Gov. Nils Boe to designate the week of August 31 through September 6 as Junior Legion Baseball Week.

Because this program is a nationwide event and because it has benefited young Americans all of these years, I think it is fitting that Junior Legion Baseball Week should be a national event. Therefore, I am introducing a joint resolution that in honor of the 40th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion baseball program, the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period from August 31 through September 6, in 1965 as "National American Legion Baseball Week" and inviting the Governors of the several States to issue similar proclamations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period

from August 31, through September 6, in 1965 as "National American Legion Baseball Week," introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STUDY OF RECREATION IN THE LAKE TEXOMA AREA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the location of Lake Texoma with large metropolitan areas both to the north and to the south has made it one of the most popular recreational areas in the mid-United States.

However, although recreation now has become a most important function at the reservoir, recreation is not included as one of the purposes for the project. There is considerable evidence that recreation should be so included, and I believe an additional study of this proposal would be beneficial.

Therefore, I submit a resolution calling for such a study.

May I point out that more than 7 million persons visited Lake Texoma in 1963 and that more than 8 million visited it last year. It is estimated that some $25 million was spent by visitors to the area last year.

Total investments around the lake amount to more than $30 million, not including private boats and yachts. There are more than 60 homesite areas and, of course, the shoreline is only partially developed.

The need for power has been reduced by the completion of a number of hydroelectric projects since Denison Dam, and recreation has gained in importance every year.

My resolution would provide for a review of the Lake Texoma situation by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. That Board would be charged with making a recommendation about the advisability of modifying existing project purposes to include development of recreation as a project purpose and about the feasibility of conducting pumpback and silt studies.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 91) was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 13, 1902, is requested to review the reports on the Red River and Tributaries, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana, submitted in House Document Numbered 378, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, and subsequent reports with a view to determining whether, in addition to the authorized purposes for which the Denison Dam-Lake Texoma project is being operated and maintained, namely: flood control, generation of hydroelectric power, navigation, water supply, regulating the flow of Red River, and other beneficial purposes, it would be advisable to modify the existing project to include the development of recreation as a project purpose and to conduct pumpback and silt studies of the project.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES; THAT COMMITTEES BE AUTHORIZED TO FILE REPORTS; AND THAT THE VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE BE AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate, following today's session, until March 29, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that the committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] may be added as a cosponsor of S. 1065 and that, in future printings of S. 1065 his name be added.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1175, to amend title II of the Social Security Act, and that he be so listed at the next printing of the bill.

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1117, the rapid transit bill, and that his name appear on this bill when it is next printed.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 15, 1965, the names of Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MORTON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1506) to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize grants under the act for community action programs in the field of consumer credit education and consumer debt counseling, introduced by Mr. BENNETT on March 15, 1965.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSALS TO EXTEND THE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations will hold a hearing on Monday, March 29, 1965, in room 1318 of the New Senate Office Building on two bills proposing the extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The two proposals under consideration will be S. 1134, which I introduced on February 17, giving the President permanent authority to submit reorganization plans to Congress under the existing limitations of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and S. 1135, which was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. It would limit the extension of the President's authority to submit reorganization plans to a 2-year period. Both proposals will be thoroughly reviewed and studied. Officials of the Bureau of the Budget will testify.

NOTICE OF CLOSE OF RECORD ON HEARINGS ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES FOUNDATION BILLS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the chairman of our Subcommittee on the Arts and Humanities, I announce that the record on the hearings recently conducted on the Arts and Humanities Foundations bills will be closed at the end of the day Monday, March 29. Any person desiring to submit comments on these proposals should deliver them to the subcommittee by that date.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 125)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the message from the President of the United States on reorganization of the Bureau of Customs. The message has been read in the House. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

All that we do to serve the people of this land must be done, as has been my insistent pledge, with the least cost and the most effectiveness.

In my state of the Union, I announced it was this administration's intention to "reshape and reorganize" the executive branch. This goal has one objective: "to meet more effectively the tasks of today."

I report today now one step taken forward toward that goal as part of our progress "on new economies we were planning to make."

I submit today a plan for reorganization in the Bureau of Customs of the Department of the Treasury.

At present the Bureau maintains 113 independent field offices, each reporting directly to Customs headquarters in Washington, D.C. Under a modernization program of which this reorganization plan is an integral part, the Secretary of the Treasury proposes to establish six regional offices to supervise all

Customs field activities. The tightened management controls achieved from these improvements will make possible a net annual saving of $9 million within a few years.

An essential feature will be the abolition of the offices of all Presidential appointees in the Customs Service. The program cannot be effectively carried out without this step.

The following offices, therefore, would be eliminated: collectors of customs, comptrollers of customs, surveyors of customs, and appraisers of merchandise, to which appointments are now required to be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Incumbents of abolished offices will be given consideration for suitable employment under the civil service laws in any positions in Customs for which they may be qualified.

When this reorganization is completed, all officials and employees of the Bureau of Customs will be appointed under the civil service laws.

All of the functions of the offices which will be abolished are presently vested in the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 which gives the Secretary power to redelegate these functions. He will exercise this power as the existing offices are abolished.

The estimate of savings that will be achieved by the program of Customs modernization and improvement, of which this reorganization plan is a part, is based on present enforcement levels, business volume, and salary scales. Of the amounts saved, approximately $1 million a year will be from salaries no longer paid because of the abolition of offices.

The proposed new organizational framework looks to the establishment of new offices at both headquarters and field levels and abolition of present offices.

This results in a net reduction of more than 50 separate principal field offices by concentration of supervisory responsibilities in fewer officials in charge of regional and district activities. In addition to the 6 offices of regional commissioner, about 25 offices of district director will be established. The regional commissioners and district directors will assume the overall principal supervisory responsibilities and functions of collectors of customs, appraisers of merchandise, comptrollers of customs, laboratories, and supervising customs agents.

At the headquarters level, four new offices will be established to replace seven divisions. A new position of Special Assistant to the Commissioner will be created and charged with responsibility for insuring that all customs employees conduct themselves in strict compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. Up to now this function has been one of a number lodged with an existing division.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

It should be emphasized that abolition by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 of the offices of collector of customs, comptroller of customs, surveyor of customs, and appraiser of merchandise will in no way prejudice any right of any person affected by the laws administered by the Bureau of Customs. The rights of importers and others, for example, before the customs court, arising out of the administration of such functions will remain unaffected. In addition it should be emphasized that all essential services to the importing, exporting, and traveling public will continue to be performed.

This reorganization plan will permit a needed modernization of the organization and procedure of the Bureau of Customs. It will permit a more effective administration of the customs laws.

I urge the Congress to permit Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1965.*

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

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

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Transcript of interview of Senator DIRKSEN by Joseph F. McCaffery over WMAL–ABC–TV, February 7, 1965.

THE USE OF GAS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the use of even a nonlethal gas in South Vietnam is shocking. It cannot be justified—despite all the protestations of Secretary McNamara and Secretary Rusk—on moral or practical grounds.

Morally, the use of any gas rests on extremely tenuous ground. As the Geneva Protocol of 1925 pointed out, "the use of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases" has been "justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world."

The protocol made no distinction between lethal and nonlethal gases. Nor, for that matter, have we. During World War II—the most widespread and deadly war in history—and all of the Korean action we refrained from chemical warfare. Recently, there have been increasing reports of the use of chemical warfare by the Egyptians in Yemen. Will we now condone such actions on the basis of our own?

We cannot escape the consequences of our actions by legal sophistries. We may not have ratified the 1925 protocol, but we have effectively bound ourselves to its terms by our actions. There is no question but that the use of gas is wrong. More than that, it is just plain stupid.

The use of gas in South Vietnam has accomplished nothing, at a very great risk to our interests. This is scarcely a sound rule of conduct in international affairs.

The gas was used three times. Twice there were no Vietcong in the area. On the third occasion, a strong wind prevented the gas from being effective, and the "people were not very ill."

It is claimed that the gas is a humane weapon for use when the Vietcong have mingled with the civilian population and we cannot tell friend from foe. If we cannot tell before we use the gas, I fail to see how we can tell after the victims have recovered from its effects.

Moreover, I understand that we have even failed to provide effective protection to the South Vietnamese troops who use the gas. We have issued them gas masks designed for the bigger boned and larger stature American soldiers, and the loose fitting masks present a real hazard to the South Vietnamese.

Still another tragedy of the use of gas in Vietnam is the effect on our allies. President Johnson has painstakingly put together a growing consensus of world opinion that he is right in resisting aggression. His policies have been receiving overwhelming support at home and increased understanding abroad.

Now that support has been placed in jeopardy. A constituent of mine sent me a telegram today which asks a very appropriate question: "Do we not take diplomatic soundings beforehand?" From what information I can gather, the answer is "No." Expressions of shock and outrage have come from around the world.

We have opened Pandora's box. We have begun an action which never should have started. Let us end the use of gas in South Vietnam now.

Mr. President, in yesterday's New York Times Mr. James Reston discussed the use of gas in Vietnam. I think everyone should read this article carefully and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON: JUST A LITTLE OLD "BENEVOLENT INCAPACITATOR"

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 23.—The Pentagon's main argument for using nauseous gas in Vietnam is that it is better in some cases to gas the Communists than to maim or kill them. The officers here even have a wonderful phrase to describe the new instruments of chemical warfare: "benevolent incapacitators."

This, of course, was the defense for using poison gas in the First World War. It wasn't very benevolent and it often incapacitated a man for life, and it sent such a shudder through the world that even in so savage a conflict as the Second World War it wasn't used.

Secretary McNamara was careful to explain that he was not supplying poison gas to the South Vietnamese Army. He almost sounded as if he was doing the Communists a favor by treating them like rowdy race rioters in Rochester, but the thing is not quite as innocent as he made it sound.

WHAT NEXT?

The trouble with reverting to the use of any kind of gas in war is that it opens up so many other possibilities of chemical warfare. The use of gas on the battlefield has almost stopped in the last two generations, but the art of chemical warfare has not.

There is now a whole new arsenal of gases that not only nauseate, but stun and paralyze the enemy. The military correspondent of the Evening Star in Washington, Richard

Fryklund, for example, recently reported on the latest and best—a gas called BZ by the U.S. Army.

He tells of recent tests of BZ at the Army's Chemical Warfare Proving Grounds at Dugway, Utah. Volunteer soldiers were submitted to the effects of BZ while they were executing simple battlefield operations.

"In one case," he reports, "a soldier on guard duty was gassed. He was approached by a strange soldier who said he did not know the password. The guard tried to remember what to do about it, couldn't, got tired of the whole problem and sat down and went to sleep. * * *

Secretary McNamara emphasized that the only gas that was used in Vietnam was the same as the gas that can be purchased at a store. But the same argument made for nauseous gas could also be made for BZ or even for some of the paralyzing gases. After all, it is more benevolent to paralyze a man than to kill him with a machinegun.

Where do you draw the line on the McNamara argument? And even if you draw it at nauseous gas, how do you know what gas the enemy will use after you start this devilish business?

The national policy on the use of all chemical weapons has been that the United States would consider using them only if the enemy used them, but the Pentagon's reaction to the criticism of using nauseous gas was merely to express surprise that anybody would be disturbed.

Nobody concerned has even claimed that the use of the gas was effective. The military spokesman in Saigon said it proved of little value on the three occasions it was used. In two cases, according to United Press International in Saigon, it was discovered that no Reds were in the area. In a third, a few Communists may have been "demoralized," but "there was a fair wind that day and the people were not very ill."

The main effect was merely to nauseate a lot of people all over the world with the thought that gas could be used merely on the authority of the South Vietnamese soldiers concerned.

One unfortunate aspect of the incident was that it occurred precisely at the moment when the United States was beginning to gain a little more understanding in the world for its policy in Vietnam.

Ever since the United States started bombing North Vietnam and dropping napalm firebombs on Communists targets, there has been a considerable outcry for negotiations to end the war. President Johnson has insisted from the start, as he told 42 State Governors at the White House this week, that he would go anywhere at any time if he thought he could serve the cause of peace, but that there was simply no evidence that the Communists were interested in negotiating a settlement in Vietnam.

This view is now being confirmed by the principal foreign offices of the world. The British Foreign Secretary underscored the point at the White House today. He told the President that the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, had said in London a few days ago that it was useless to talk about negotiations.

REBUFFED ON TALKS

The French, who have been the principal agitators for a negotiated settlement, now concede that their explorations in Peiping and Hanoi have been rebuffed, and the Canadians report that their official on the International Control Commission in Vietnam was not even given the opportunity to discuss negotiations with the North Vietnamese Communists.

Accordingly, the propaganda over Vietnam was beginning to turn a little to the American side, when the gas incident was disclosed, incapitating our own propagandists, and not very benevolently either.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today, March 25, 1965, marks the 144th observance of Greek Independence Day. Throughout history, the Greeks have been leaders in man's endless quest to secure for himself the blessings of liberty. It is to their courage and indomitable spirit that all those who value freedom pay tribute on this occasion.

Few people in history have had to undergo the hardships which the Greeks have endured for the sake of freedom. From the age of the city-state when they stood fast against the Persian invasions, through their 6-year long battle against Ottoman domination, the victorious outcome of which we observe today, until the present when Greece stands as a proud bulwark of democracy on the very threshold of a nation dedicated to the eradication of popular government, their fight has been long and often bitter. But seldom in history has the noble cause of liberty had as determined an adherent.

The concept of democracy which lay at the foundation of the government at Athens more than 2,000 years ago has had a most profound effect on the development of Western political theory and practice. The Greeks' emphasis on the dignity and rights of the individual, and on the rule of law, are the most basic and important components of democratic governments today.

A year ago our feelings of joy on this occasion were saddened by the news of the death of King Paul. The loss of this man, so strongly committed to the lofty principles of his Greek heritage, was keenly felt. Today, however, more than a year after the reins of government passed into the capable hands of his son and successor, King Constantine, people of Greek ancestry have even more reason to take pride in their nation's history and accomplishments. Today Greece continues as living, positive proof of a people's dedication to democracy.

I have long valued the friendship and counsel of the large Greek community in Massachusetts. I also value my friendship and associations with the Greek Ambassador here in Washington, Mr. Alexander Matsas, who has served his country well.

To these friends, and to their Hellenic brothers throughout the world, I extend my sincere best wishes on this important anniversary.

RETIREMENT OF HON. DOUGLAS DILLON AS SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I think this is an appropriate time to speak of the retiring Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon. I should like to read from an editorial entitled "Changing Guard at Treasury," published in the Washington Post of March 20, 1965, in which the following statement is made about the retiring Secretary:

In embracing the modern theory of fiscal policy, in reforming the depreciation guidelines, in dealing vigorously and imaginatively with vexing balance-of-payments deficits, Douglas Dillon wrote a brilliant record at the Treasury. He was by far the best Treasury Secretary of the postwar period, and it is, indeed, doubtful whether he has a peer in this century.

The judgment expressed by the Washington Post is held by many in the Congress and the country, and I cannot add to it. In every post that Douglas Dillon has held, whether it has been Ambassador to France, Under Secretary of State in the administration of President Eisenhower, or Secretary of the Treasury, under President Kennedy and President Johnson, he has brought to all of these important positions unusual ability, courage, the sense of duty, a patriotic desire to serve his country, and an unfailing sense of humor. He is uniquely fitted for public service, and I have no doubt that in the future he will be called upon again to serve our country. He deserves the commendation and the best wishes of the Senate, and Congress and, indeed, the American people. And it can be said that Mrs. Dillon has brought the same high sense of public duty and loyalty to every task.

SALUTE TO THE NATION'S AIRLINE INDUSTRY, AND TO THE SPLENDID ROLE CALIFORNIA HAS PLAYED, AND WILL PLAY, IN ITS EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, just 40 years ago this month, the first regular year-round U.S. domestic air passenger service was established. I am proud to recall that it happened in California. The airline was known as Ryan Airlines and it operated between Los Angeles and San Diego. The airline is no longer in existence, and the route has since been taken over by other airlines, but it did mark the beginning of regular passenger air service as we know it today.

At that time, the one-way fare between the two cities was $17.50 and the flying time was 1 hour and 30 minutes. Today, the flying time is only 30 minutes and the fare is only $10.35.

Mr. President, I am proud of the way in which the people of my State have participated in the expansion and improvement of the commercial airline industry of this country and throughout the world. We are now almost on the threshold of a supersonic air transport system in which we shall be able to fly from New York to Los Angeles in a matter of minutes.

That is a dramatic improvement in service, and this small segment typifies much of what has been happening throughout the entire air transportation network.

Because this month is an anniversary of an important air transportation event, it provides an excellent opportunity to review some of the improvements that have taken place in our overall air transport system and to take a look at some of the airline plans for improvement in the future.

Californians could well take a good look at air transport, because aviation has meant a great deal to California and the entire west coast. The two grew up together.

The growing up has encompassed four decades of technological revolution. The

first decade began with the first transcontinental air-rail passenger service linking Los Angeles and New York. Passengers took trains by night and flew by day. The whole trip took 48 hours. While that seems slow by present-day standards, it was a lot better than the 80 hours it took to travel between the two cities by rail alone. The one-way fare was $339.48. Passengers flew in an unpressurized, three-engine Ford plane that was proud of the fact that it had "large square windows that could be opened in flight for fresh air."

The second decade began in 1935 with a revolution in overocean communications. Giant seaplanes took off from San Francisco to provide regularly scheduled air service to Manila in 59 hours of flying time and 6 elapsed days versus weeks by sea. Technological improvements came thick and fast. Sleeper flights were introduced, transcontinental time was cut to 14 hours, transatlantic service began, four-engined pressurized planes became standard, and the first all-freight planes went into service.

The third decade, from 1945 to 1955, saw the industry take advantage of the momentum created by the aviation technical advances of World War II. Round the world scheduled air service from California began in 1947. Californians could reach New York in 7½ hours in the new DC–7. The introduction of long-range planes such as these permitted a transpolar route from Los Angeles across the top of the world to London and Scandinavia. Regular air mail helicopter service was initiated by Los Angeles Airways.

The fourth decade brings us up to the present and anyone who has flown across the Nation in the last few years is familiar with the comfort and speed of the jet aircraft. The flight time from Los Angeles to New York is less than 5 hours and the one-way, first-class fare is $160.90, a far cry from the $339 and the 48 hours of 1929. One one occasion, I flew on a commercial flight from Los Angeles to Washington in a little more than 3 hours.

This brief history coincides closely with the rapid development of California as a center of commerce and industry and as the most populous State in the Nation. California's contribution to the progress of aviation has been considerable. Since the very beginning, this State has been the primary manufacturer of aircraft. Of the total airline aircraft in service, almost 63 percent was built in California. These aircraft have enabled the airlines of the United States to take leadership in world aviation. At the same time, the airlines' purchase of these aircraft has had a booming effect upon the State's economy. Since the end of World War II, some 2,331 airliners have been purchased by the airlines of this country and the world, pumping some $5 billion into California's economy.

California represents a key State in the air transportation system. More than 15 percent of all of the Nation's airline men and women work and live in the State and the annual airline payroll runs close to $200 million.

Not only do Californians build airliners, they also fly in them in great numbers. More than 7 million passengers a year board commercial airliners in California, a number equal to the entire population of metropolitan Chicago. Last year, more than 33 percent of all the passenger miles operated throughout the entire United States were on planes which originated, terminated, or passed through California. Actually, airline surveys show that Californians fly more than the average U.S. citizen. The odds are that the passenger sitting next to you on any transcontinental flight will be a Californian. Thus, Californians are among the airlines' best customers and, at the same time, the airlines are one of California's best customers.

The airlines have experienced good years and lean years. Even during the lean years of the late fifties and early sixties, they had the courage to commit billions to reequip themselves for the civil jet age which we now enjoy.

Many questioned the wisdom of their decision at the time it was made. Some said: "The airlines are doing well enough with propeller equipment; why should they take a chance on the jets until their profit picture improves?" The risks were very large, but the airlines turned out to be farsighted. Now that the airlines are experiencing their first good year in a very long time, we should not forget the financial risks they took during the lean years.

We should be aware, too, that at the beginning of the fifth decade that a new technological revolution is taking place. The long-range jets are being supplemented by short-range jets like the DC–9, which rolled out early this month and will be in service soon. This new plane, and other jets like it, will bring jet service to many smaller communities. Understandably, many of these smaller communities have been impatient for this improved service. New and more productive versions of the longer range jets are also being planned.

Right now the airlines have so far announced orders for 300 new jets which will cost them more than a billion and a half dollars. The current jet fleet is 558; hence, as of now, an increase of 53 percent in the number of jets is planned. New orders are being announced every week.

By the end of California's fifth decade as a partner in the air age, the supersonic jet will be a reality. The current feasibility studies indicate that an SST is well within our capability to build and to operate economically and safely. Currently, the Government is weighing designs from two manufacturers, one of which is the California-based Lockheed Co.

Airline planning sees the SST coming into service some time early in the next decade. When the supersonic age arrives, it will have a dramatic effect on our transportation pattern. Californians will cross the country in a little over an hour, and no place in the world will be more than a few hours away from California. The SST program represents a challenge and an opportunity for the United States and it is hoped that we will move ahead in this important program with all possible speed.

The new air transportation system which is being built, brick by brick, also includes hundreds of millions of dollars worth of ground equipment.

One of the primary objectives of the airlines is to eliminate delays due to weather. California is a leading producer of all-weather landing systems which are currently being tested by the airlines for installation in the next few years.

Also, the 120 million passengers who will be flying the airlines by 1970 will require enormous investments in electronic reservations equipment. California has a stake in this investment, also, since the State is a leading producer of electronic devices.

This is a brief summary of an extensive list of new equipment that the airlines are in the process of purchasing, designing, and installing. Obviously, this new transportation network in the air and on the ground will cost a great deal of money. Fortunately, the airlines are finally achieving a level of adequate earnings. The airlines are going to need not only one good year but many good years if they are going to do all of the things that they need to do to improve their system.

The money that they are earning and which they hope to make has a lot of work to do. As customers looking forward to ever-improving airline service, and as a leading supplier of airline equipment, people in California hope that the airlines may soon achieve a sustained period of prosperity.

The airline industry has a major impact on the economy. Expansion of its services means thousands of new jobs in the airlines, thousands of new jobs at airports and around airports, thousands of new jobs in the electronics industry, and the fuel industry, as well as in the aircraft industry and its related groups of suppliers.

The Nation's airline industry is an invaluable national resource. California is proud of its role as a major contributor to airline development. We look forward to a new decade of technological revolution. California will again play a leading role in helping the airlines improve and develop the Nation's vital transportation system.

NORTH AMERICAN WATER AND POWER ALLIANCE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the best of the many articles now appearing in national magazines and newspapers on the North American Water and Power Alliance concept was carried Sunday in the Washington Post.

NAWAPA would trap the wasted water of Alaska, the Yukon, and British Columbia, and channel it to the Canadian plains, the Great Lakes, the Western United States, and Mexico. It is the bold new concept for meeting America's water crisis which is under study by the Western Water Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent article on NAWAPA written by Frank C. Porter, and entitled "A Gasping Continent Sees an Arctic Oasis," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A GASPING CONTINENT SEES AN ARCTIC OASIS

(By Frank C. Porter, Washington Post staff writer)

Water became such a problem in Montana at one time that it sold for $1 a barrel while the same quantity of oil brought only 10 cents.

Today, the lack of water is reaching crisis proportions—not just for a single State but for the Nation as a whole—and is widely advertised as America's most pressing resource problem.

Western States have taken to squabbling over the already inadequate supply from the Colorado River. The Great Lakes have fallen to dangerously low levels. Water engineers, particularly in the great urban areas, wonder how they will meet the growing needs of industry, agriculture, and a population expected to top 200 million in only a few years.

But planners are drawing new hope from a proposal that might solve the problem at one massive stroke. This is a bold $100 billion plan to divert wasted water from the continent's great Northwest to thirsty areas of Canada, the United States, and Mexico.

The huge integrated system is designed to end the critical water shortage in the Western States, restore the Great Lakes to their normal level, and furnish 70 million kilowatts of new power—or one-third the present generating capacity of the entire United States.

It would be history's biggest public works program.

It would provide a vast complex of waterways, including a 2,000-mile seaway from Lake Superior into the heart of Alberta which could be extended to Vancouver on the Pacific coast. It would give Mexico eight times the amount of new irrigated farmland that the Aswan Dam will create in Egypt.

Its proponents believe that it would take care of the continent's water needs for at least the next century, but the plan's implications go far beyond water and power.

Those who have worked on it claim that it would markedly accelerate the economic growth of all three countries. They conceive of it as an adjunct to the administration's poverty program in that it would create, directly and indirectly, an estimated 4 million new jobs—roughly the same figure as the number of unemployed in the United States.

It is also claimed that the system would greatly increase land values and thereby broaden the tax base; that it would provide vast new recreational facilities, and that it would be a boon to dozens of industries, including construction, steel, copper, aluminum, cement, building equipment, and electronics.

Christened the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA), the scheme has been developed over the past 5 years as a labor of love by the Ralph M. Parsons Co., a big engineering and construction firm based in Los Angeles.

It so impressed some legislators that a special Senate Public Works Subcommittee held little publicized hearings on the plan last October. The subcommittee's chairman, Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, hopes to win President Johnson's support and has written twice to Secretary of State Dean Rusk asking that talks be initiated with the Canadian Government.

So far, there has been no official response from Rusk, but some administration officials are known to be intrigued by the idea. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, for example, has said: "I'm for this type of thinking. I'm glad the engineers think so much of it and I want more people to hear about it."

But whatever enthusiasm it stimulates, NAWAPA may never come out of its dream state. If it should jell, it will take 10 years to plan and at least another 20 to build, Parsons engineers estimate. It presents almost endless complexities in international relations, sectional rivalries, cost and engineering analyses, financing problems, resource allocation, and the like.

"The evaluation itself is a tremendous job," says Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. He notes that Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River, a huge project but minute compared to NAWAPA, took 25 years to plan and has been under construction for another 25.

On the other hand, NAWAPA is unlikely to die an easy death. "Everyone who has worked on it has fallen in love with it," says a Parsons consultant. And every engineer who has studied it thoroughly is convinced of its feasibility, he adds.

Grandiose and visionary as it may appear, few experts are disposed to laugh NAWAPA off if only because of its impressive sponsorship. It was conceived by the late Donald McCord Baker, retired water planning engineer for Los Angeles.

He took it to Parsons, which turned over its facilities to him for further study and carried on the project after Baker died. Parsons' prestige (the company was prime systems contractor for Minuteman and Titan, among other things) has not hurt NAWAPA.

The system would originate in Alaska and Canada's Yukon Province, where huge dams would trap 20 percent of the runoff from such big river basins as the Tanana, the Yukon, the Copper, and the Susitna and store it in a series of interconnected reservoirs at an elevation of about 2,000 feet.

The water would then flow south through a complex of canals, tunnels, lakes, dams, lifts, and reservoirs, picking up new supplies in British Columbia from the Liard, Frazer, Peace, Kootenay, Columbia, and other rivers. Where the terrain rises, giant pumps would lift the waters a total of 1,000 feet.

The heart of the system would be the Rocky Mountain trench, a fingerlike 500-mile reservoir contained in a natural gorge extending down into Montana. From the northern end of the trench, a canal dredged to 30 feet depth would extend all the way to Lake Superior, furnishing water and transportation to the great plains of southern Canada.

An offshoot of the Canadian-Great Lakes waterway, the Dakota Canal would feed into the upper Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, making them navigable the year around. Another offshoot canal would lead through Lake Winnipeg northward to Hudson Bay.

The flow from the Trans-Canadian waterway would lift the now-depressed level of the Great Lakes back to normal, reduce present pollution, enhance power generation at Niagara, and improve St. Lawrence Seaway navigation by stabilizing its level.

Two other waterways would flow into Lake Huron; the James Bay Seaway, connecting with Hudson Bay, and the Knob Lake barge canal, which would help open up the vast mining areas of central Quebec.

South from the Rocky Mountain trench, a further complex of canals, tunnels, and waterways would carry water to virtually the entire West and to the three northernmost States of Mexico.

Parsons claims that the system would recoup its investment in 50 years and that it could be operated for about $500 million annually. Receipts from water and power alone would top $4 billion yearly, it figures, and half these revenues would go to Canada—a good talking point to counter any nationalistic resentment that might develop in the Dominion against the concept of shared resources.

Actually, more and more Canadians are coming to realize that their nation can become an indispensable provider for the big sister south of the border. For example, British Newfoundland Corp., a huge consortium, is now trying to line up New England and New York as prime customers for a $2 billion, 6.5-million-kilowatt hydroelectric plant it hopes to build at Grand Falls on the Hamilton River in Labrador.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of Oregon's excellent daily newspapers, the Eugene Register-Guard, carried an editorial which I find extremely valuable in reminding me of what the U.S. Constitution actually provides regarding voters' rights.

National attention is focused on the inability of a large segment of the American population to vote. This editorial makes a compelling point:

The heart of the Federal effort is not to give the Negro the vote, but to prevent the States from keeping it away from him because of his race.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of March 18, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXAMINING THAT "RIGHT TO VOTE"

Widespread misunderstanding of the right to vote has been revealed in the wake of troubles in Selma and the President's request for broader Federal powers to protect the Negro right. One Oregon editorial page even carried the amazing assertion that the U.S. Constitution "very specifically grants the right to vote to all the citizenry of this Nation."

Not so. The Constitution grants nobody the right to vote. However, the course of American history has dictated that the right be extended more and more broadly. Thus the right is a part of the American tradition, almost a part of the unwritten Constitution, even though the great document itself is almost silent on the matter.

The Constitution makes these provisions:

"That those who vote for Members of Congress shall not have to meet qualifications different from those who vote for members of the more numerous house of the State legislature. (By custom this has been extended to those who vote for presidential electors.)

"That the right to vote shall not be abridged because of color, race, or previous condition of servitude.

"That the right shall not be abridged because of sex.

"That the right shall not be abridged because of failure to pay a poll or other tax."

Beyond that, it's a matter of State decision. Most States place 21 as the voting age. But 2 use 18. Others could. Or they could use 16 or 35. Residence requirements vary, too, from as little as 30 days in some town elections to 2 years in Alabama, Mississippi and South Carolina. (In Oregon, it's 6 months, except that persons who have lived here a shorter time may vote for President and Vice President.) Literacy tests vary. States may or may not make provisions for absentee voting.

At the Constitutional Convention delegates could not agree. Should there be universal suffrage, or should the vote be saved for those of high economic and social status? Leaving the matter to the States was a compromise. And most States restricted the vote considerably, usually requiring at least the ownership of property as a qualification. New Hampshire took a major step forward in 1794 when it instituted the poll tax in

place of property ownership. Thus the poll tax was, in the beginning, a liberalizing, not a restricting, device. Oregon, until 1948, restricted the vote in school elections to the owners of real property.

Gradually the right to vote was extended throughout the States, to whites and free Negroes alike. The first backward step came not in the South, but in Connecticut and Massachusetts. In the 1850's those States instituted stiff literacy requirements to prevent voting by newly naturalized immigrants.

In 1870, the 15th amendment to the Constitution was ratified by the requisite 26 States. (Oregon, by the way, ratified this one belatedly; and it did not do so until 1959, after having rejected it 89 years earlier.) This is the amendment the President is asking for machinery to enforce. It prohibits a State from preventing a citizen from voting solely because of his race or color.

After the Civil War, as long as Federal troops were in the South, Negroes voted, often to the near exclusion of whites. Between the end of the war and 1900, three States elected Negro Lieutenant Governors. Southern States sent 22 Negroes to Congress in this period. Yet, after 1877, when Federal troops were no longer in the South, white supremacy began coming back.

And another, nonracial, factor entered. Late in the century the strong tides of populism began to be felt in the impoverished South. The old power structure began making voting difficult, not only to keep the Negro from the polls, but also to keep the poor white in his place. In the last decade of the 19th century, the number of Negro voters in Louisiana declined from 127,823 to 12,902. In the same period the number of white voters declined from 126,884 to 87,240.

Nonetheless the populist sentiment prevailed in many Southern communities. Demagogic politicians used the race issue then to unite the whites against the Negroes. The poor white turned not upon the rich white who sought to oppress him, but upon the Negro whom he proceeded to oppress. The poll tax and requirements as to literacy and residence were the weapons. After the Supreme Court's historic school decision in 1954, Mississippi, seeing the handwriting on the wall, stiffened its qualifications for voting.

As recently as 1958, the Supreme Court upheld the validity of literacy tests. In *Lassiter v. Northampton Board of Elections*, coming up from North Carolina, the Court upheld the tests, but said they must be "absent of the discrimination which the Constitution condemns."

It is this "discrimination which the Constitution condemns" that is at the heart of the Federal effort—not to give the Negro the vote, but to prevent the States from keeping it way from him because of his race.

S. 218: A BILL TO KILL EFFECTIVE FPC REGULATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Federal Power Commission is similar to a conscientious police force trying to carry out its duties: without constant citizen support it cannot continue to do its job, and those it seeks to regulate in the public interest assume control of the situation. One such effort to subordinate consumer interests to private aims is currently embodied in a bill pending before the Senate Commerce Committee—S. 218.

The Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Joseph C. Swidler, has transmitted to the Senate a detailed analysis of S. 218. Mr. Swidler's analysis points up clearly the dangers inherent in this truly startling piece of legislation, which would wipe out major functions of the Federal Power Commission.

REPEAL OF AUTHORITY SOUGHT

This is a tricky piece of legislation, but in effect we are asked to emasculate the work of one of our Nation's major regulatory agencies. In the words of Mr. Swidler:

S. 218 contains only two sentences but they would substantially repeal the Commission's regulatory authority over interstate power companies.

Probably the greatest evil of S. 218 is in the effect it would have on the Nation's small, privately, municipally, and cooperatively owned electric power companies who are dependent upon the large utilities for wholesale power supplies. The bill would do away with existing safeguards over such sales.

COMPANIES OPPOSE RATE REDUCTIONS

Reasons for the opposition of private parties to FPC's authority are not hard to find. The current Commission has, in an unprecedented manner, taken seriously its responsibilities in the field of regulating interstate wholesale sales of electricity. Statistics show the rate increases granted by the Commission during the past 3 years, compared with the rate decreases in wholesale sales of electricity:

Fiscal year	Reductions	Increases
1962	$127,100	$2,030,900
1963	1,204,795	278,902
1964	1,448,125	489,400
1965 (1st 8½ months)	7,454,000	740,000

Mr. President, the Federal Power Commission deserves the congratulations and commendations of all of us for this remarkable record of rate reductions, most of which will be passed along to benefit the average American citizen who consumes this electricity. If rate reductions for the balance of fiscal 1965 continue on the same basis, they will amount to over $11 million for the year, compared with only $127,000 3 years ago. As Mr. Swidler so aptly comments:

It is no coincidence that this attempt to repeal the substance of the Federal Power Act, while retaining the shell, comes when the Commission, for the first time in its history, has under way a comprehensive and vigorous program to bring about reductions in excessive wholesale rates.

At this moment the Commission has before it 35 rate proceedings or investigations of wholesale contract terms involving annual bills in excess of $100 million.

CONSUMERS ENTITLED TO FAIR RATES

It is small wonder that many major power companies are eagerly supporting S. 218, which would take the heart out of the FPC's jurisdiction over these sales. Numerous companies are making unwarranted profits, and they are making them at the expense of the ultimate consumer through overcharging small privately and publicly owned electric systems. The effect of S. 218 on the FPC's future rate reduction activities is well summarized by Chairman Swidler:

S. 218 would require the Commission to dismiss every one of these cases, not because the record supports the existing rates, but on the unfounded assumption that the work is unnecessary. The wholesale power customers of this Nation and the consumers they serve are entitled to the benefit of rates that can be defended as reasonable under the standards of the act and the decisions of the courts.

STATES NOT EFFECTIVE REGULATORS

The pretense of S. 218 is that it will give jurisdiction which it strips from the Federal Power Commission back to the State regulatory agencies. Amazingly, some of the State regulatory agencies have come to the support of the bill on this ground. The FPC analysis meets the argument squarely:

We submit that wholesale rate regulation in interstate commerce is a matter of national concern. It has never been carried on effectively by the States because it involves utility operations and national policies which are beyond the reach of any single State. This is the reason the Federal Power Act was passed in the first place.

Mr. President, the last sentence quoted needs to be underscored: "This is the reason the Federal Power Act was passed in the first place." I think we all need to be reminded of that fact.

This innocent-looking piece of legislation would effectively gut an agency created by the Congress of the United States to police an industry whose activities were not subject to the normal competition of the marketplace. By the time the Federal Power Act was passed, the electric power industries empire was already so far out of hand that it threatened the entire economy.

FUTURE OF REGULATION AT STAKE

With two sentences, S. 218 would return our country to the state of affairs that existed before the act was passed. It does not do it boldly and directly, but rather by indirection and subterfuge. It needs to be exposed for the ill-advised course it suggests we take. As Mr. Swidler says:

The fact is that the alternative to FPC regulation of wholesale transactions is no effective regulation at all.

The Federal Power Act is only 30 years old. But if S. 218 is enacted, this reform statute will assume the character of an old man—a toothless caricature devoid of strength and capable of only staring helplessly at abuse. It seems to have taken three decades for this law to realize its potential, and I do not support those who would cut it down in its prime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report on S. 218, together with an analysis of S. 218, prepared by the Federal Power Commission be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, REPORT ON S. 218, 89TH CONGRESS

A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission

S. 218 contains only two sentences but they would substantially repeal the Commission's regulatory authority over interstate power companies.[1]

[1] A detailed explanation of the bill's provisions is attached as app. A.

The first sentence of S. 218 would exempt from Commission justification any utility whose system is interconnected with an interstate power pool if the utility confines its ownership of facilities to one State and is not directly and permanently connected with the facilities of a utility deriving its major revenues in another State. This provision would immediately exempt some 55 of the Nation's 180 major electric power utilities each of which is an integral part of an interstate power network but interconnects only with companies in its own State. This is not all. In addition, if S. 218 were enacted, most of the Nation's remaining utilities could organize themselves so as to escape Federal regulation, simply by creating new companies at the State line.

The second sentence sets up a complicated test which when applied to the practical circumstances of the industry would exempt all sales at wholesale by major public utilities to municipalities, to cooperatives, and to many investor-owned companies. It would thus eliminate the Commission's wholesale rate justification insofar as it applies to thousands of small systems throughout the Nation which are dependent on the major power systems for their bulk power supply.

In the Commission's opinion, the enactment of S. 218 would mean the end of responsible regulations of this Nation's electric utility systems which Congress established in the Public Utility Holding Company Act in 1935. We strongly urge that it not be adopted.

A brief description of the scope of the Commission's existing authority under the 1935 Federal Power Act may be helpful in evaluating the intended impact of S. 218.

Under existing law, there is a clear division of responsibility between the Federal Government and the States. The States are given exclusive jurisdiction over the sale of electricity at retail, whether the electricity originates from intrastate or interstate sources. The Federal Power Commission's rate jurisdiction is limited to sales at wholesale in interstate commerce and to the interstate transmission of electric energy.

In addition, the FPC has been given the responsibility for establishing and enforcing a uniform system of accounts applicable to all public utilities coming within its jurisdiction; for passing on mergers of such utilities among themselves and with other electrical systems, large or small; for preventing interlocking directorates; and for insuring that local distributors of power can secure the interconnections with such utilities necessary to receive power upon reasonable terms.

As indicated, this basic authority, which is part of the congressional effort through the Public Utility Holding Company Act to prevent recurrence of the abuses which had beset the utility industry, would be immediately eliminated for about a third of all of the electric companies. What this would mean can be judged from the fact that the Commission removed from the rate base of seven of these companies, who would no longer be subject to the Commission's accounting jurisdiction, $47 million as a result of Commission audit of their books. The elimination of the authority to prevent interlocking directorates between such companies and with other public utilities, or to approve their merger with or acquisition of other electric systems, would clearly also be a long step backwards toward the days of unimpeded intercompany manipulations.

The exhaustive congressional and Federal Trade Commission hearings which preceded enactment of titles II and III of the Federal Power Act in 1935 revealed to the Nation the urgent necessity for Federal regulation of the price at which electric energy is sold at wholesale in interstate commerce and for control over the accounting and financial practices of these utilities. The committee report on this legislation pointed to the fact that even in 1935 "local operating units have been tied together into vast interstate systems" and "were entirely beyond the reach of the States either legally or practically." (S. Rept. No. 621, 74th Cong., 1st sess., p. 17.)

Congress recognized the need for Federal regulation when only a small fraction of the Nation's electrical systems were interconnected in interstate pools. The recently completed national power survey points out that "today 97 percent of the industry's generating capacity is to a greater or lesser degree interconnected in five large networks." The largest existing group of interconnected utilities covers roughly the entire Eastern United States, as well as two Canadian Provinces.

The national power survey projected possible savings of as much as $11 billion a year by 1980 if the industry takes full advantage of the economies inherent in large-scale, multistate operations. We do not suggest that the large utilities would be unable to profit by these technological developments in the absence of Federal regulations. We strongly believe, however, that such regulation is essential if wholesale customers, and in the long run the American consumer, are to receive their share of the benefits.

It is no coincidence that this attempt to repeal the substance of the Federal Power Act, while retaining the shell, comes when the Commission, for the first time in its history, has under way a comprehensive and vigorous program to bring about reductions in excessive wholesale rates. Attached to these comments is a detailed listing of the 35 separate proceedings or investigations in progress before the Commission in which rate reductions to wholesale customers or the elimination of unfair terms in wholesale contracts are being sought. These proceedings involve every region of the country and affect the rates to some 600 power distributors involving annual wholesale power bills in excess of $100 million.

S. 218 would require the Commission to dismiss everyone of these cases, not because the record supports the existing rates but on the unfounded assumption that the work is unnecessary. The wholesale power customers of this Nation and the consumers they serve are entitled to the benefit of rates that can be defended as reasonable under the standards of the act and the decisions of the courts. We believe there is no reason in the public interest for the Congress to enact S. 218 which would call a halt to the Commission's active and successful program of rate regulation, and there is every reason for continuing this important activity.

The need for a continuing Federal regulation of the wholesale rates which would be decontrolled by S. 218 is pointed up by the rate reductions which the Commission's efforts have brought about. Starting with fiscal year 1962 (July 1, 1961–June 30, 1962), the reductions and increases in wholesale rates allowed each year by this Commission were as follows:

Fiscal year	Reductions	Increases
1962	$127,100	$2,030,900
1963	1,204,795	278,902
1964	1,448,125	489,400
1965 (1st 8½ months)	7,454,000	740,000

There are many factors which have contributed to this record, but we believe that one of the most important is this Commission's determination to fully exercise its regulatory responsibilities under the Federal Power Act. This program is just beginning to gather momentum, but the many millions of dollars of rate reductions already achieved is ample proof of the need for its continuation. The fact that wholesale customers throughout the Nation are bringing their rate problems to the Federal Power Commission is the clearest demonstration of the fact that these problems cannot be solved at the local level.

We submit that wholesale rate regulation in interstate commerce is a matter of national concern. It has never been carried on effectively by the States because it involves utility operations and national policies which are beyond the reach of any single State. This is the reason the Federal Power Act was passed in the first place.

What is at stake is not merely rates to consumers but the most efficient use of our natural resources. Federal regulation is necessary to assure the availability of low-cost power from interstate power pools at reasonable rates to the many small utilities, public and private, whose operations are not carried out on a scale large enough to enable them to generate their own power from the most economical sources. In the absence of Federal regulation, they will be required in many cases to continue to build small and relatively high-cost generating stations which fail to make the most efficient use of our natural resources. In other cases, access to low-cost power sources may be a question of survival for the smaller systems.

The Nation values its pluralistic power economy and the place in it of the independent small systems—public, cooperative, and investor-owned. The necessity for Federal regulation to assure the survival of these small- and medium-size power systems is unmistakable. The National Power Survey found that there are over 3,600 electric power systems in this country today but that the 100 largest systems account for about 89 percent of total generation. There are about 1,500 small systems which purchase part or all of their requirements at wholesale from public utilities subject to FPC jurisdiction.

Regulation is vital if the small systems and the millions of consumers they serve are to receive their fair share of the benefits which the emerging power pools make available. The enactment of S. 218, besides eliminating the Commission's authority to assure bulk power supply on fair terms to existing customers, would also eliminate the Commission's authority to order the additional interconnections which in many situations are needed to permit small systems to share in the benefits of scale enjoyed by the large utilities in existing pools.

S. 218 is being advocated on the theory that the sales at wholesale in interstate commerce to thousands of power distributors throughout the Nation are matters of local concern and that these rates can be effectively regulated by the States. If maximum efficiency is to be achieved, the wholesale rates of systems which are joined in multistate pools cannot be regulated by the separate and different treatment of the various State commissions. No one State could be familiar with the transactions of a multistate pool, transactions which go to the heart of fixing wholesale rates for any company in the pool.

There are also practical reasons of economy and efficiency which support the wisdom of the congressional decision in 1935 to lodge wholesale rate responsibility at the Federal level. This specialized activity requires the efforts of experts who devote their full time to mastering the intricate operations of these interstate power networks. Few, if any, of the State commissions could be expected to staff itself for the discharge of this specialized responsibility. Indeed, it would be most wasteful and inefficient to set up 48 Power Commission already has the staff which is performing this task to the satisfaction of the wholesale customers for whose benefit regulation is intended. The diverse separate organizations which could not possibly do an effective job, when the Federal policies of the States if they made a serious

attempt to carry out this responsibility would impose a great strain on pool formation and operation.

The fact is that the alternative to FPC regulation of wholesale transactions is no effective regulation at all.

S. 218 is not the first attempt by the electric utilities to gain exemption from the effective regulation. A bill similar to S. 218, the so-called Miller bill (H.R. 2972, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), was introduced and received the support of the utilities in 1947. However, after comprehensive hearings were held on this proposal before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the bill failed to be reported out of committee. During the decade of the 1950's when the Commission's electric rate work was almost nonexistent, there were no attempts to pass such decontrol bills.

Congress, however, in 1954 reiterated its belief that Federal regulation of the electric utilities is necessary. In passing the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to encourage the private power companies to build atomic generating plants the Congress inserted a specific provision of that act, section 272, to insure that the regulatory provisions of the Federal Power Act were applicable to the transmission and sale at wholesale of such energy in interstate commerce. Congress wanted to be sure that the benefits of this new source of power, developed at the Federal Government's expense, were passed on to the wholesale customers.

In the words of the Supreme Court, the Congress in 1935 "drew a bright line easily ascertained, between State and Federal jurisdiction." The Congress recognized then, what is even more true today, that the practicalities of electric regulation are such that Federal regulation of interstate wholesale sales together with State regulation of all retail sales is the line of division of responsibility which makes sense in this particular area of our Federal system. Such a division of authority has served the consuming public and the industry well for three decades. There is no good reason to eliminate the Federal Government's area of responsibility to regulate the Nation's largest and fastest growing utility industry and every reason to continue this important activity. We urge the Congress not to enact S. 218.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
By JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

ANALYSIS OF S. 218, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Section 1 provides for citing the bill as the Federal Power Act Amendment of 1965.

Section 2 declares the matters which would be exempt under section 3, below, to be matters primarily of local concern and subject to regulation by the States.

Section 3 would amend subsection 201(f) of the act. The first sentence would exempt from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction any company, including any nonprofit corporation or membership or cooperative association engaged in rural electrification, where (a) all of the generating and transmission facilities of such company are wholly within one State; and, (b) none of the facilities of such company is directly connected with the facilities of any public utility otherwise than by a Federal Power Commission authorized or approved emergency connection, or by a connection within the same State with the facilities of a public utility deriving the major portion of its electric revenues from sales at retail or for resale at retail within such State.

The second sentence of the bill would exempt transactions involving the sale or, within the State in which delivery takes place, the transmission of electric energy to any entity exempted by subsection 201(f), as amended by this bill, or to any nonprofit corporation or membership or cooperative association engaged in rural electrification, by a person or public utility which derives a substantial portion of its electric revenues from sales of electric energy at retail within such State.

I

A. The first of the new sentences added by S. 218 would exempt from any regulation by the Commission electric utilities which:

1. Own or operate facilities for the generation and transmission of electric energy wholly within one State, and

2. Are not directly interconnected with another public utility, except by:

(a) An emergency interconnection authorized or approved under section 202, or

(b) A connection within the State with a public utility deriving the major portion of its revenues from retail sales within the State or from sales for resale within the State.

[Rural electrification cooperatives are mentioned as being included among the "persons" eligible for exemption, but only if they qualify under the above tests.]

B. Retain the Commission's jurisdiction over:

1. Electric utilities owning or operating facilities in two or more States;

2. Electric utilities permanently interconnected with other utilities at State borders; and

3. Utilities permanently interconnected within the State in which all their facilities are located with a utility in group (1) or (2) which does not derive the major portion of its revenues from sales at retail or for resale within such State.

II

Under the second of the new sentences sales at wholesale in interstate commerce would be:

A. Exempt from the Commission's rate jurisdiction under sections 205 and 206 of the Federal Power Act if made to:

1. Any "entity" exempted from Commission jurisdiction by subsection 201(f), as herein amended [including not only the electric utilities covered by I, supra, but all the Federal and State governmental bodies already exempted by section 201(f)] or

2. Any rural electrification cooperative, by any "person or public utility" a "substantial part" of whose electric revenues from sales within the State in which the sale is made is derived from sales at retail.

Since almost all sellers of electric power are vertically integrated and derive a substantial part of their revenues in any State from retail sales, all wholesales sales to municipalities, to other governmental bodies, and to the exempt utilities under the first new sentence (the category (1) sales), or to cooperatives (the category (2) sales), would be exempt, except in the few cases where the seller is predominately a wholesaler or transmission company.

B. The Commission would retain jurisdiction over wholesale sales in interstate commerce:

1. Between electric utilities which remain "public utilities," and

2. By a public utility to a cooperative or municipality at the border of, or across the border into a State in which the seller has no substantial retail sales, assuming that delivery of a border sale is deemed to take place in the buyer's State.

III

Under the second new sentence the bill would also exempt from Commission jurisdiction the transmission of electric energy within the State in which delivery is made to the facilities of any exempted entity or cooperative and would also exempt the transmission facilities themselves. The purpose of the provision is not clear but it could be argued that it would have the effect of precluding Commission jurisdiction over wheeling to or for municipalities or cooperatives and to provide that a company doing business primarily in one State does not lose its exemption if it operates facilities in another State which are used solely for wheeling purposes.

Proceedings and investigations underway

Name of public utility	Wholesale revenue	Number of wholesale customers	Location of customers by State
Southwestern Electric Power Co	$2,756,992	23	Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma.
Kentucky Utilities Co	4,748,702	19	Kentucky.
Virginia Electric & Power Co	6,822,738	37	Virginia and North Carolina.
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co	1,180,724	11	Pennsylvania.
Interstate Power Co	1,687,436	35	Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.
Appalachian Power Co	2,181,666	6	Virginia.
Illinois Power Co	3,096,410	19	Illinois.
Western Light & [redacted] Co., Inc	1,231,185	25	Kansas.
Wisconsin Power & Light Co	5,080,150	40	Wisconsin.
Lake Superior District Power Co	702,812	4	Wisconsin and Michigan.
Florida Power Corp	5,236,416	20	Florida.
Central Illinois Public Service Co	6,562,688	26	Illinois.
Pennsylvania Electric Co	3,707,868	19	Pennsylvania.
Arkansas-Missouri Power Co	824,337	6	Missouri and Arkansas.
Missouri Power & Light Co	375,775	7	Missouri.
San Diego Gas & Electric Co	99,347	3	California.
Dayton Power & Light Co	2,420,621	23	Ohio.
Florida Power & Light Co	1,829,142	7	Florida.
Kansas City Power & Light Co	472,289	11	Missouri and Kansas.
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co	2,709,772	23	Arkansas and Oklahoma.
Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	5,750,346	17	Oklahoma.
Nantahala Power & Light Co	119,942	3	North Carolina.
Central Vermont Public Service Co	124,855	6	Vermont.
Union Electric Co	1,731,506	8	Iowa and Missouri.
Missouri Edison Co	25,577	1	Missouri.
Eastern Shore Public Service Co. of Maryland	1,057,936	15	Maryland.
Northern States Power Co. (Minnesota)	5,309,461	40	Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota.
Wisconsin Michigan Power Co	1,928,200	[redacted]	Wisconsin and Michigan.
Delaware Power & Light Co	2,626,800	[redacted]	Delaware.
Alabama Power Co	5,547,894	[redacted]	Alabama.
Kentucky Power Co	505,862	[redacted]	Kentucky.
Georgia Power Co	14,765,911	[redacted]	Georgia.
Mississippi Power Co	2,343,928	[redacted]	Mississippi.
Duke Power Co	15,659,004	[redacted]	South Carolina and North Carolina.
Eastern Shore Public Service Co. of Virginia	195,310	[redacted]	Virginia.
Total	111,446,602		

OREGON COUPLE NOT DUPED BY AMA PROPAGANDA

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, among the many letters I have received pertaining to the promotion of "eldercare" by the American Medical Association, the one I am calling to the attention of the Senate today is a typical example. Since the administration cannot spend an equal amount in support of S. 1 as that being spent by the AMA, I must answer each letter I receive individually and try to correct some of the false impressions that have been created.

Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Olsen, the authors of this letter, found in a surgeon's office "an array of colorful brochures on eldercare—one served to confuse because it was entitled 'Help Make Medicare Fair.'" This couple was alert to the issues and the AMA's campaign, and took the trouble to write me about it.

The colorful pamphlet to which the Olsens refer is just one example. Appearing in most of Oregon's newspapers is an advertisement that states the following:

> The medicare legislation (H.R. 1), now before Congress and backed by the administration, is unfair because it promotes medical assistance for everybody over 65 years—rich and poor alike, regardless of need.

Nowhere does it say "eldercare," or that its sponsor is AMA. However, it ends in heavy dark type: "Write your Congressman to support H.R. 3727—the fair-medicare proposal." The logic used here seems very strange. The advertisement implies that medicare is unfair because it is equal, and in order to be fair it should be inequitable, and to do this we write our Congressman to support H.R. 3727.

There are many more examples. However, I prefer to let the letter from an enlightened constituent tell the story, and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Olsen printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PORTLAND, OREG.,
March 9, 1965.

Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: My husband, 72, and I, 58, have each two daughters, all of them rather poor. We have, still, $5,000 in the bank, just about enough for a real bout of illness. We have a small home about four-tenths paid. My husband receives $79 per month in social security, and I have a part-time office job which pays around $100 a month: out of this we pay $61 GI house payment and over $40 per month for inadequate hospital and surgical care. Would you consider us among "the wealthy, the well-to-do, and the self-supporting"?

My husband, Clarence, will have a serious operation in 10 days. In the surgeon's office he found an array of colorful brochures on eldercare—one served to confuse because it was entitled "Help Make Medicare Fair." In these we found your name, address, and proper salutation with the suggestion that courtesy and/or a compliment were desirable. This was not difficult because we have followed your long and sensibly liberal voting record and have read in the daily press of your concern for the plight of the average sick senior citizen. On reading the pamphlets further we learned that "The problems of the over-65 population, which have been highly exaggerated, are diminishing," and that "eldercare, which helps those who need help, undoubtedly would cost less in the future as more and more elderly reach retirement age with increased assets and more retirement income." We have evidently not cultivated friends among the affluent group with whom the doctors are acquainted, and I think a much larger group cannot pass a means test and also cannot afford proper medical advice and treatment.

We write to urge you to vote for medicare, H.R.1. We feel the passage of this bill would remove the specter of a costly future siege of hospitalization. Mutual of Omaha has just raised my husband's senior policies about 20 percent, due to rising hospital costs. Our insurance provides $20 of the $40 per day average for room and board, but special hospital services over and above this expense sometimes exceed same. By taking a means test after our cash reserve is gone we could, as things now stand, obtain public hospitalization. But how about our small home, and how about that American freedom of choice?

Why is the AMA spending millions to promote eldercare, an unhelpful plan in poorer States where help is most needed, instead of medicare? They emphasize that it would increase taxes. Is their opposition to medicare grounded in concern about the overtaxing of our children (the latter are hopeful that we not become dependent on them, remember?), or in concern about loss of profits for doctors and hospitals? Many AMA members are conscientious and dedicated, and many opposed to the cold-blooded policies. We have been warned by insurance agencies against medicare. Does an insurance shadow loom back of the solid AMA lobby?

In conclusion, medicare's low-cost plan is better than nothing. If it is unsound fiscally to add medical care it can be left out and provided by private insurance. Let us keep our homes and enough money to maintain our pride: limit our incomes to $10,000 if necessary, but please pass a decent medicare, call it what you will.

Sincerely yours,

ESTHER M. OLSEN,
CLARENCE E. OLSEN.

MILITARY NEWSPAPER REFUSES PUBLICATION OF GI BILL ARTICLE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, despite diligent and continued efforts on behalf of the supporters of the cold war GI bill, our ability to keep the servicemen informed of its merits and progress has constantly been thwarted by boycotts on behalf of the military, the press media, and indeed this body itself, by refusing consideration of the bill for over a year during the 88th Congress. This is so despite the fact that the bill was on the calendar.

I have spoken before of the Defense Department's desire to maintain our cold war veterans in a state of "intellectual servitude" by opposing this bill and by retarding information concerning it, even though they are supposedly the spokesman for the young men who would benefit by the bill.

The proof of this censorship has recently been revealed to me in the form of an article written for the Gateway Newspaper, a publication at Andrews Air Force Base here in Washington. This article was written in the normal course of duty by a writer on the staff of the Gateway News, which is not an official Department of Defense publication. Yet, this article was not allowed to be printed, with the excuse given that the Department of Defense was opposed to the bill. Because they are opposed to the bill, they have exercised censorship over a nonofficial publication.

The determination of the Defense Department to refuse to help the cold war veteran is seriously impeding the ability of our servicemen to even read about the cold war GI bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter transmitting this article, with the omission of the signature to protect the courageous serviceman who informed me of this injustice, be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with the article to illustrate the quality and newsworthiness of that suppressed information.

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

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Here is the story written by an Air Force sergeant of which I spoke to you about over the [redacted] last Wednesday. The writer of the story took great pains to insure that he did not offend the Department of Defense, administration, or any other organization that would cause the story to be killed. I personally feel he did write an unbiased and objective story and that the paper should have printed it; especially since it was a byline story; clearly indicating that the story was based on his own opinions and views.

I called you hoping that you might be able to take the very story that military policy caused to be scrapped and use it to show why many of our military personnel, especially those in remote areas like Antarctica, Vietnam, Cuba, etc., are not aware of the existence of such a bill.

This story definitely doesn't compromise any security material which simply means that the story was killed due to personal opinion by the so-called brass in the Armed Forces. If this is the case, which seems quite evident, then the Department of Defense, which is supposed to represent or act as a lobby for the majority opinion of our military personnel has, without canvassing an opinion, taken upon itself to oppose a bill which I found to be favorable with the majority of the persons I have spoken to in reference to the bill.

This is the kind of freedom of expression in the services which often leads to ignorance of current issues among its personnel.

Hope you can use this and if I can be of any further help please don't hesitate to call me. Hope everything is going well with you.

Sincerely,

[redacted].

COLD WAR BILL—S. 9

Navy Journalist (JO3) Richard W. Kelly is assigned to the Naval Air Facility at Andrews Air Force Base. Recently, the native of Coral Gables, Fla., was invited to appear before Congress in behalf of the passage of a new cold war bill (S. 9), which if enacted, would make educational assistance and home loan guarantees to some 5 million eligible veterans.

Invited to appear before the Senate's Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee by its chairman, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, and ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, a strong proponent of the measure, Journalist Kelly told the Senators, in part, this story:

"I first became interested in the cold war bill during my deployment with a Seabee battalion to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, resulting from the Cuban crisis in late 1962. Had I

been able to afford it, I would have been in college instead, but like so many other young Americans, I joined the military service shortly after graduating from high school. Now that my enlistment is ending soon, I would like to go to college in order to realize my education goals. I'm still confronted with financial difficulties, but with Uncle Sam's help, I'm sure that I can achieve my educational ambitions."

To this, Senator YARBOROUGH added:

"Each year a large number of our American youths enter military service to give from 2 to 4, or more, years of their lives to the defense of their country. They do so, and this country needs them to do so, because foreign powers continue to threaten the security of this Nation and the free world. So long as there is a Vietnam, a Berlin crisis, or an island threat from Cuba, our American youth will be required to serve their Nation. The bill I have introduced provides an opportunity to demonstrate that we, as a nation, do recognize the extreme, unique personal sacrifices exacted from our cold war veterans by their military service."

The Texas Senator also pointed out that only 44 percent of the draft-eligible young men ever serve their country in uniform. While these men are sacrificing 2 to 4 years of their lives just at the crucial age of peak development, the 56 percent of their counterparts are utilizing this time to further their careers and develop their futures. It is just these admirable young men who are serving their country that are least able to afford an education, least prepared for a civilian occupation, and those who have to struggle the hardest to survive the competition for the future. Hence, the injustice is magnified, as we take the very men who must struggle the hardest in life, and set them 2 to 4 years behind in their competitive position, just because they do the admirable thing and are among the 44 percent who defend their country.

"Last year," added Mr. YARBOROUGH, "unemployment compensation for veterans increased $2 million to over $96 million—money which could have reaped benefits if used for the training of veterans. Here is the place where cold war veterans need help. He does not need a 'reward'—what he needs is a 'chance.' Whatever his military experience, hazardous or not, there is a need for readjustment assistance to help him get his ship of success back into the mainstream of opportunity."

According to Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. KENNEDY, and 38 other Senators who joined together for introducing the cold war bill at the first session of the 89th Congress on January 6, 1965, the measure will provide service men and women, upon discharge, vocational readjustment and restore lost educational opportunities whose higher learning ambitions were interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967.

It is by no means a bonus or a pension plan; it is simply a readjustment plan to train a veteran to become self-sufficient and thus avoid the necessity of a bonus or a pension. It is a way to give these young men, like journalist Kelly, an opportunity to return to civilian life and to realize their educational objectives at the most formative time in their lives.

Frankly speaking, the cold war GI bill, if enacted, will more than redress inequities and provide opportunities. In addition, it will help build an educational fortress which, in the long run, will be of more value in defending our freedom than all the armaments in existence.

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on this date, 144 years ago, March 25, 1821, Greek patriots struck a blow for freedom in raising their flag of liberty against all of those who had sought foreign domination of them. After more than 400 years of alien domination, against which they regularly struggled to cast off the chains of foreign rule, the freedom-loving Greeks threw off the yoke of intervention and became their own rulers.

Perhaps one of the most notable aspects of this successful revolution was the direct inspiration which the Greek people received from the American revolution which preceded it by almost 50 years. Not only did the Greek revolution have the sympathy of the American people, but constant support was echoed from Americans throughout our Nation.

The Greeks, on the other hand, looked to America with hope and inspiration, and, after winning their freedom, one of the first acts of the Greek Senate was a tribute to the American people.

Today, we pay honor to the heroic sacrifices of the Greek peoples in that struggle for freedom, and the whole free world pays tribute to that day in history when the flag of freedom was raised over Greece.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of the day and the remainder of the week, insofar as he knows it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the questions raised by the distinguished minority leader, as the Senator knows, the business for today will be Calendar Nos. 116 and 117. The first is a bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research. The second is a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended, and the Clean Air Act, as amended, to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution.

Both of these bills were reported from their respective committees unanimously. It is anticipated that there will be some speeches this afternoon.

At the conclusion of business today, the Senate will go over until 12 o'clock noon Monday. Next week, we shall have such measures to consider as S. 390, permitting volunteer fire companies to use second- and third-class bulk mailing at the rates established for nonprofit organizations; numerous resolutions from the Committee on Rules and Administration; S. 1462, authorizing contract with the Middle Rio Grande, conservancy district, New Mexico, for payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; S. 1000, permitting transfer of title to movable property to agencies assuming maintenance responsibility for project works serving industrial and municipal functions; S. 254, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon; and S. 1229, uniform policies with respect to recreation, if reported.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query further whether it is the intention of the majority leader to go over from the end of business today until next week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF WEST GERMANY AND THE REPUBLIC OF ISRAEL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had expected to detain the Senate with an address on the relationships between the Federal Republic of West Germany and the Republic of Israel. I am not at all sure, in view of the committee meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary as it concerns the voting rights bill, which committee will meet again this afternoon, that I shall have an opportunity to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with such clippings and other material as I have gathered on the subject.

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

SPEECH OF SENATOR EVERETT DIRKSEN

A great historical event took place last week when the German Federal Republic and the State of Israel established formal diplomatic relations.

The Federal Republic did not yield to the tactics of Nasser. All free nations will be pleased with this firm and prompt action of Chancellor Erhard's government.

At the end of my remarks, I shall enter in the RECORD excerpts of editorials and news items from the U.S. press, like Chicago Daily News, New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Chicago's American, Chicago Jewish Sentinel, and other papers. Also, I should like to include the dossier of the East German leader Ulbricht, who presides over the German Soviet Zone, where 17 million Germans are waiting for the day to gain their freedom.

May 8 will mark the 20th anniversary that Germany, because of Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, has been divided—just like North and South Korea, and North and South Vietnam. But we know that 99 percent of these 17 million Germans are anti-Communist and are praying daily to be reunited with their own country. Let us hope and pray that we will not witness another disaster, too, before the East German people are free.

I have noted with great satisfaction that the bill to extend the statute of limitations for Nazi war crimes was introduced in the German Parliament on recommendation of the Erhard cabinet and already it has had overwhelming support on the rollcall by our colleagues of the German Bundestag, after its first reading. As in our own country, such laws are made, or approved, or changed by a vote of the Parliament. The first vote in the German Parliament indicates that when the

third reading takes place, this law will become the law of the German Federal Republic.

Now, my distinguished colleagues, Senator JAVITS, Republican, of New York, Senator RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, Congressman MULTER, Democrat, of New York, and Senator SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated January 7 and 15, and February 1, 1965), paid high tribute to the Ambassador of the German Federal Republic, His Excellency, Dr. K. Heinrich Knappstein, for the forthright position he has taken on the issue of extension of the statute of limitations for Nazi war crimes. We all respect Ambassador Knappstein for his moral courage. He is a true patriot of his country and a great friend of our Nation. He started his diplomatic career in my own State, in the city of Chicago, as the first German consul general after World War II. I was glad that my colleagues paid tribute to him.

My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, paid tribute last week on the floor of the Senate to the German Parliament for their decision. Senator JAVITS included in his remarks many editorial comments, which need not be reprinted here. But it is worth repeating Senator JAVITS' personal remarks with which I would like to associate myself (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated March 11, 1965, page 4871):

"EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN THE GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

"Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Bundestag of the German Federal Republic yesterday acted affirmatively by an overwhelming vote in taking the necessary parliamentary step to bring about an extension of the statute of limitations so that there should be no time limitation at all applied to prosecutions for murder and genocide. Three hundred and thirty-three of the four hundred legislators present voted to send to committee proposals to eliminate entirely the statute of limitations as it applies to these crimes.

"This action of the Bundestag is convincing proof of the desire of the German people to take the necessary steps to prevent any Nazi criminal who can be found from escaping prosecution for his acts. The Bundestag of the German Federal Republic is to be highly commended for the forthright stance it has taken on the side of justice.

"I ask unanimous consent that newspaper articles on that subject may be printed at this point in the RECORD."

However, today, I wish to pay tribute to Ambassador Knappstein's chief, Chancellor Erhard, and the German Parliament on their prompt action of establishing diplomatic relations with Israel. And my congratulations to Prime Minister Eshkol of Israel and his Parliament for their quick and wise decision, and their prompt action in ratifying the Prime Minister's action.

In a lengthy address last week, Chancellor Erhard expressed great satisfaction and happiness that finally Israel and Germany have established normal diplomatic relations. The German Chancellor has defied Nasser's pressure tactics.

In explaining the position of Germany, he said among other things (following are excerpts of the address which the Chancellor delivered in Munich after both countries agreed to diplomatic relations):

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY CHANCELLOR LUDWIG ERHARD

"I would like to state here explicitly that I feel deep satisfaction that the Israeli people, their Government and their Parliament have grasped the hand which we stretched out to them, and that we have, after so many tragic years of detachment, now established the ground for peaceful order, for normal and beneficial relations with Israel. I am convinced that this step will also contribute to establish peace in the Near East area in general.

"The nonexistence of diplomatic relations with Israel was in my eyes always an unnatural situation and I am happy that I decided to clear the way."

In 1960, Chancellor Erhard's predecessor, the great, retired Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, met the then Prime Minister Ben-Gurion in New York. Chancellor Erhard's decision was not a sudden one; it was uppermost in his mind. This is confirmed by a statement that Professor Erhard made last October, long before the new tension developed between Bonn, Cairo and Tel Aviv.

Speaking to the German Parliament last October, Chanceller Erhard even then said:

ERHARD'S REMARKS LAST OCTOBER

"The tensions in the Near East continue to represent a danger spot for world peace. Our Near East policy, therefore, requires careful consideration and watchfulness (permanent attention and scrutiny).

"In this area we have no special political interests, but only the desire that its nations, with whom we wish to maintain equally good relations, may attain economic and social progress on a basis of a peaceful atmosphere.

"Our relationship to the State of Israel is not only determined by political considerations. It cannot be separated from the burden [responsibility] which national socialism inflicted on the German people. We have tried to heal what human power is able to heal. But we know, no matter how great our good will is, the past cannot be forgotten. The Federal Government sincerely regrets that certain incidents disturbed the gradual improvement of the German-Israeli relationship and caused serious concern in Israel. All the more I welcome the most recent statement by the Israeli Prime Minister before the Knesset (Israel Parliament). I acknowledge with appreciation that Prime Minister Eshkol makes efforts to understand the problem (situation and position) of the Germans.

"We very well understand that in particular the work of German scientists in countries, whose relationship to Israel is extremely strained, causes bitterness and stirs up feelings of tension. Prime Minister Eshkol has recognized that such activities are widely condemned among the German people. In this connection, the Federal Government regrets and disapproves any activity by Germans in foreign countries which could result in danger to peace.

"I would like to add that we shall exhaust all possibilities which will contribute to remove from the Israeli nation the feeling of threat (menace) to peace by Germans."

A few days ago, Washington was honored with the visit of the new majority leader of the German Parliament, the distinguished Dr. Rainer Barzel. Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, was host to Dr. Barzel at a Senate luncheon. Dr. Barzel succeeded the great statesman Dr. Heinrich von Brentano who, after a long illness, passed away last year. We all remember Dr. von Brentano's great friendship, his moral courage, and his statesmanship when he was Dr. Adenauer's Foreign Minister. In Dr. Barzel the German Parliament has selected a worthy successor.

Dr. Kurt Birrenbach, another member of the German Parliament also visited with us and later went to Israel. Both were emissaries of their Chancellor, Dr. Erhard; both conferred with many of our colleagues and the State Department. I was also pleased to see that President Johnson, who determines our foreign policy, and whose foreign policy we must support, conferred at length with Dr. Barzel.

Dr. Barzel and Dr. Birrenbach also conferred with important American laymen, thus preparing themselves to brief their Chancellor, Dr. Erhard, and to give him a true picture of American sentiment on the important questions facing not only Israel and Germany but the entire free world.

The leadership of American Jewry have shown wise and great restraint during this crisis. I could mention many names, but I am proud that among these men are Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress and Mr. Morris Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee. Two of my own constituents did their utmost in the interest of the United States and our allies—Israel and the German Federal Republic—namely, the Honorable Philip Klutznick, former Ambassador to the United Nations and honorary international president of B'nai B'rith, and my long time friend, Maj. Gen. Julius Klein.

In addition to the newspaper editorials and commentaries, I ask for permission to insert in the RECORD the statement by my old and distinguished friend Gen. Julius Klein of Chicago, who has served his country with distinction in peace and war. He is known to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle; he has performed special missions for Senate committees for which he received the highest tribute from our colleagues of both parties. Julius Klein was a close associate of our late leader Senator Taft. He is a good friend of our Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, and of many others who serve in both Houses of Congress. His statement reads as follows:

"Chancellor Erhard's action in establishing full diplomatic relations between West Germany and Israel is most commendable and deserves the plaudits of all free men. Equally does the decision of Prime Minister Eshkol and the Israel Parliament, taking quick action to grant Germany's request for the exchange of ambassadors.

"Chancellor Erhard demonstrated the courage to defy the blackmailing tactics of the Egyptian dictator Nasser. This move will have a most responsive effect and encourage the free world not to yield to political, economic, and military blackmail.

"This is a most historic event, and again illustrates the sympathies and friendship of Chancellor Erhard and the people of Germany, and the distinguished former chancellor, Dr. Adenauer, manifested ever since the State of Israel was first established.

"Free people throughout the world have noted with great satisfaction that the Erhard government introduced legislation to extend the statute of limitations against Nazi war criminals. The first reading of this bill has already taken place in the Bundestag. It will get sufficient votes to become law in Germany so that no Nazi criminal who can be found will escape just punishment.

"I hope that the Western powers will help to break down the Berlin wall, behind which 17 million Germans are enslaved. This is a position the United States has long supported, and is of greatest importance not only for a united Germany but also for the free world. The Soviet puppet in East Germany, Walter Ulbricht, has done everything possible to bring about chaos. No Nazi criminals are being tried or traced behind the Berlin wall. No restitution has been made by East Germany to Jewish victims of nazism. No help was given to Israel by the Ulbricht regime, which has recently pledged $100 million to help Nasser.

"Israel remains America's most trusted fortress of democracy in the Middle East, and the Federal Republic of Germany is our loyal military, political and economic ally. Our Government's policy in regard to the Federal Republic should be supported by all Americans. We all hope that Israel and Germany will soon exchange ambassadors

and continue to support each other in the interest of all free nations."

Many people in the United States do not realize that there are at the moment, according to Ulbricht and Moscow, two "Germanys." The Berlin wall of shame separates the German people and it is Mr. Ulbricht who, under orders from Moscow, has been directing a vicious campaign not only against the Federal Republic and Israel but also the United States. Twenty years have gone by since 17 million Germans were enslaved.

As stated previously, May 8 marks the 20th anniversary of this tragic event in history when Stalin cynically disregarded the Soviet's obligation and commitment—the pact entered into with the other three powers—England, France and the United States with relation to Berlin. What was supposed to have been a four-power agreement in maintaining some kind of stability in Berlin became instead a divided city separated by a huge barbed wire wall with Mr. Ulbricht at the helm in East Berlin and East Germany. Not until the wall is taken down, and not until the Germans are united again will tensions and conflict in Europe be eliminated.

While all of us have our eyes trained on the Far East at the moment, we must not overlook this important problem facing the West, and especially our loyal NATO ally, West Germany. We must not wait until another explosion takes place.

I present for the RECORD a short dispatch from the New York Times, dated March 19, 1965, concerning an address by the president of the American Jewish Congress, Dr. Joachim Prinz, in which he also castigated the Ulbricht Communist regime in East Germany. If I had the complete text before me, I would insert it in full. It reads in part:

"U.S. JEWISH LEADER SCORES GERMAN RED STAND ON ARABS

"WASHINGTON, March 17.—Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress castigated the East German Government Wednesday for its 'Arab adventurism' in the Middle East.

"Addressing the national convention of the women's division of the congress at the Shoreham Hotel here today, Dr. Prinz said that while the Jewish community was justified in criticizing West Germany, the Communist regime to the East represented a greater danger.

"'Here is a regime,' he declared, 'that boasts of former Nazis who hold high Government offices, that refuses to offer any restitution or indemnification for the horrors of Nazism and that today openly supports the reckless militarism of the Arab States'."

Some years ago, we had the honor and privilege to welcome on the floor of the Senate our at-that-time German colleague Dr. Wolfgang Pohle, a distinguished parliamentarian, jurist and top industrialist. I recall with pleasure when we listened to him at the luncheon and dinners given in his honor by our late colleague Senator Styles Bridges, and the then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Senator DODD, Congressman CELLER, and others. He explains in a letter to a friend the still-existing problem in Germany that again came to the special attention of the American people when the issue of the statute of limitations for Nazi war crimes became a subject for headlines, and caused protest all over America.

We are all happy that this problem is on the way to being solved, just as we are about the prompt action that the Erhard government took when they established diplomatic relations with Israel last week.

Because Dr. Pohle is a distinguished scholar, and has been a member of the international, legal, and parliamentary bodies, his remarks are of great importance, and point up the difficulties of the constitutional and political problems involved in extending the statute of limitations. What Dr. Pohle has to say on the subject deserves also our careful attention. Here are his observations.

DR. POHLE'S LETTER

"A motion has been put in the Bundestag by Abgeordneter Benda (Berlin CDU), which was signed by many members of the House, for instance, by Dr. Wilhelmi, supporting an extension of the statute of limitations for war crimes. At present I am making investigations as to the form of such an extension. Probably the basic idea is, that from 1945 onwards the statute of limitations for such crimes does not cover 20 years, but 30 years, and that, for instance, also crimes committed at the beginning of the Nazi-regime, i.e., in the years 1933 and 1934, are not yet barred by the statute of limitations.

"I realize, of course, the extraordinary propaganda and the political importance, which must be attached to such a measure. As you know, there are a number of personalities supporting such a step, i.e., businessmen, scientists and personalities in public life apart from the Bundestagsabgeordneten. This opinion can be found among all groups of the population.

"But the whole affair has to be regarded also from another aspect. I recently told Ambassador von Etzdorf so in London, who the next day had visitors representing several organizations, which also pleaded with him for extension of the statute of limitations. In this context I do not deal with the question whether the extension of the statute of limitations or the omission of such a measure is compatible with a constitutional state, or whether it is consistent with the Grundgesetz (constitutional law).

"The whole affair is, as you say, also of greatest political importance in the reverse sense. For years the population of the Federal Republic has heard nothing else than the horrible news about the trials regarding Auschwitz, Treblinka and other camps. They all deal with crimes committed during the war. Due to the great number of these trials—as far as I know, 2,000 lawsuits are still pending and are by no means statute-barred—throughout the whole world the impression is created, that:

"1. The German people, which made common cause with the Nazis and tolerated their rule, are a gang of murders and accomplices.

"2. The crime committed during the Nazi period took place solely in the Federal Republic of Germany.

"Both impressions are an incredible distortion of the historical facts methodically directed by the East.

"As to the first point we know, since we are witnesses of that time—our children were not a part of that experience—how national socialism came into being. After the boom of the years 1926–28 there began an economic crisis, which led—supported by mass unemployment—to extreme tendencies to the right and especially to the left. When we saw at that time the Communist "Rotfront"—battalions marching through the German towns, it was indeed a terrifying sight. The German people still remembered the frightful day, when the Communist leaders Max Hoelz, Thaelmann and his companions unleashed civil war by acts of violence. The fact, that national socialism was an ultraright counter-organization, whereas the Government had, despite the existence of a small army, not much striking power, is today often forgotten. It is equally forgotten that the National Socialists were soon generally accepted by the decision of the Reichskonkordat, but several pacts with foreign countries, e.g., the German-Polish agreement, by the visits of foreign statesmen in Godesberg and Munich and by many other similar actions (Olympiade 1936, visits of foreign political leaders at the Reichsparteitag in Nürnberg). This took place at a time, when it was already known that there existed concentration camps—and that the racial question was an essential part of the National Socialist doctrine, as it is described in Hitler's 'Mein Kampf.' It was particularly disastrous, that the inner opposition movement against national socialism, which already came into being at that time and later on gained ground, did not find any response abroad.

"One should therefore present to the world a correct background of the historical facts and not an image, which is wholly distorted by the crimes in the death camps during the war (which must by no means be palliated). We owe this not only to the world, but to our young generation. Neither should this be forgotten by the world organizations.

"And 2: As far as I know, the Federal Republic is the only country coping relentlessly with its past by these trials. When I returned from Nürnberg, the idea was preponderant to enact a general amnesty. At that time this idea was also supported by politicians, whose names are today in good repute in the SPD and CSU and who are regarded as particularly moderate. This idea was, however, not realized.

"On the other hand one has never heard of such trials in the 'Deutsch-Demokratische Republik' behind the Berlin wall.

"Does the world believe, that the watchmen of the concentration camps are only living among the 55 million Germans of the Federal Republic? Does the world not think that some of these elements might also be living among the 17 million people of the DDR? In Austria, too, there are very few and exceptional investigations regarding Nazi crimes, though it must be said for the sake of truth, that noted leaders of the national socialist movement, e.g. Hitler, Kaltenbrunner, Seyss-Inquart and others were of Austrian origin.

"And what is heard about the punishment for the hundred thousand atrocities committed to German soldiers, for instance in Yugoslavia, Hungary, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland (and there also to civil service men belonging to administrative organizations) and also in France by the so-called 'resistance'—atrocities to soldiers and private persons, who mostly had no part in the national socialist movement and were only doing their duty for their country according to general moral principles and the law. And is there anything heard about lawsuits initiated by the occupation forces of the East because of the millions of atrocities (murder, manslaughter, rape) to the German civilian population? How did the Russians punish the watchmen of those 10,000 Polish officers who they killed in Katyn—as we clarified in Nürnberg? And what does the world think about the fact, that there were hundreds of thousands of SS-men coming from Norway, Belgium, Holland, Hungary, and Lithuania?

"I should not have the slightest doubt advocating the extension of the statute of limitations for war crimes by 20, 30 or even 50 years, provided this take place on a mutual basis and a general international agreement. I am sure that you, too, do not really agree to exposing and condemning the Federal Republic as sole refuge for all war and national socialist criminals, as the present actions do imply. This is certainly the result of the escalated question of the extension of the statute of limitations."

Here are some of the news stories and editorials selected from thousands that appeared all over the country:

"A Burden for Bonn: Resist Arab Blackmail," (Chicago Daily News, Mar. 15, 1965.)

"Israeli Cabinet Approves Offer of Tie With Bonn," (the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1965.)

"Nasser Spread Thin," (New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 17, 1965.)

"Israel and Bonn," (the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1965.)

"Israel Accepts Ties With Bonn," (New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 15, 1965.)

"U.S. Opposes Full Recognition by West Germany," "Bonn Makes Conciliation Moves Toward Israel," (both: Sentinel, Mar. 11, 1965.)

"Germans and Jews," (Lebecker Nachrichten, Lubeck, Germany, Feb. 28, 1965.)

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Mar. 15, 1965]

A BURDEN FOR BONN: RESIST ARAB BLACKMAIL

(By Max Freedman)

WASHINGTON.—Once again the Middle East is being slowly stirred to a new crisis. It is unreasonable to expect this area to remain quiet indefinitely while the roots of antagonism are inflamed and rancorous.

The United States is not doomed to wait in supine horror for disasters to break upon us. It can do something, but not very much, to avert the crisis. For conditions in the Middle East remind us in almost classic terms of the limitations that face American policy.

Officials in the State Department now pondering the swirl of opinion in the Arab world are aware that the most rational solutions have little chance of acceptance where the rule of reason is not respected.

Many times in recent years the leaders of Arab States have shown that the concept of enlightened self-interest is not congenial to them. They think with their emotions, often with their passions, and are in the grip of entrenched prejudices at the mere mention of Israel's name.

Since there is no shortage of prejudice and passion in Israel, the debate soon passes from the reasoned compromises of diplomacy to the embattled dogmas of a racial feud.

Watching this mournful history, repeated so many times, experienced American officials dread a return of the inflamed passions of the Middle East. They know with a sickening conviction that the United States will again be dragged into the middle of a crisis which it has done nothing to start and which it can do very little to stop.

In private, Arab diplomats concede that the occasion for the present crisis has been chosen with a singular lack of good judgment. But the choice has been made and they see no escape from its ominous consequences.

By any fair test, the recognition of Israel by West Germany cannot be regarded as a casual episode of diplomacy. It has overtones of history and tragedy, and testifies to the slow victory of reason over hate.

The German people cannot be expected to go through history dragging after them the corpse of Nazi tyranny. Twenty years have passed since the death of Hitler and a new generation has arisen without any responsibility for the concentration camps.

A succession of German leaders, beginning with Konrad Adenauer, have shown a patient sense of justice and liberality in their dealings with Israel.

Diplomatic recognition will place the final seal of reconciliation between two peoples whose tragic destiny has united them in one of the supreme catastrophes of the human story. Such a quiet end to a tragedy of tears must be cherished by all who abhor revenge as a wild justice and a mutilation of the spirit.

In Israel the response to Germany's offer has not always been wise and magnanimous. The most instructed and responsible leaders of opinion have welcomed the overture from Bonn and are eager to establish normal diplomatic relations with the German people.

The final decision in Israel was not taken without an agony of self-questioning and anxious scrutiny of conscience.

Israel in the end will accept the act of recognition with Germany not as a perfunctory gesture but as a solemn commitment to work in unity and in peace for all just causes that point mankind to the milestones of progress.

It is precisely across this historic movement of reconciliation that the Arab world has now thrown its shadow and its attempted veto. West Germany must be curiously insensitive to its own honor if it is willing to allow its relations with Israel to be dominated and determined by the threats of Arab States.

Yet the Arab leaders have not hesitated to use the brutal weapon of blackmail as their main threat against Germany. The Government of West Germany has done a service to peace by resisting this pressure, refusing to bend or break before it, and honors its commitments as if all Arab bluster were an idle pageant without meaning or weight.

All this is painfully clear to the State Department. But it has been given a sudden and disturbing insight into the passions quivering in the Arab world and it does not like what it has seen. That is why it is watching with growing anxiety the movement toward the abyss in the Middle East.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1965]

ISRAEL CABINET APPROVES OFFER OF TIE WITH BONN: 14 OF 16 MINISTERS SUPPORT PLAN TO EXCHANGE ENVOYS—TWO RESERVE DECISION—HOPE SEEN ON DISPUTES: ESHKOL EXPECTS ACCORD ON AIMS AND NAZI CRIMES—ARABS WILL RETALIATE

(By W. Granger Blair)

JERUSALEM (Israel sector) March 14.—The Israel Cabinet formally approved today the "immediate establishment" of diplomatic relations with West Germany.

The decision was announced at the end of a Cabinet session in which all but 2 of the 16 ministers in the coalition government supported diplomatic ties with Bonn. The two reserved their decisions.

[The Associated Press reported from Cairo early Monday that the foreign ministers of 13 Arab States had decided to break diplomatic relations with West Germany if it extended diplomatic recognition to Israel.]

The move came a week after a West German offer of diplomatic ties and 4 days after a special West Germany envoy returned to Bonn from here, carrying assurances that Israel would accept the offer.

Thus the decision was not unexpected, despite persistent recent reports from Bonn that Israel had specified conditions to acceptance of the West German offer that Bonn could not agree to.

MATTERS CALLED SEPARATE

These reports had been vehemently denied by authoritative sources here, who insisted that the question of ties was not dependent on other matters at issue between the two Governments.

The other matters involved West German arms supplied to Israel, extension of the West German statute of limitations on Nazi war crimes and the presence of West German scientists in the United Arab Republic.

A Government spokesman said this evening that Premier Levi Eshkol had informed the Cabinet that he had "grounds to assume" that "an agreement" would be reached with Bonn on "questions that were controversial."

A source close to the Premier was more explicit. He indicated that the question of statute of limitations beyond 20 years after the end of the war had already been all but resolved by extending the parliamentary action in Bonn. As for the German scientists, the source said the Government was "morally satisfied" with Bonn's position.

Other sources also indicated that Bonn was prepared to honor its arms obligations to Israel under existing agreements.

The problem for Bonn, it would appear, is to find a way to fulfill obligations without aggravating the Arab nations any more than necessary.

It was also understood that the ground was being prepared for arrangements to help satisfy Israel's future defense needs without violating Bonn's resolve not to supply arms to "areas of tension" in the future.

However, the whole question of Bonn's attitude on arms to Israel might be appreciably modified, in the view of informed sources, should the Arab governments, particularly Cairo, carry out threats to recognize Eact Germany upon the opening of West German-Israel diplomatic relations. Thus, attention was focused on the Arab foreign ministers' meeting in Cairo.

DEBATE TO BE TUESDAY

Premier Eshkol will present the Government's decision to the Kresset (parliament) Tuesday. Although the debate undoubtedly will be heated, there is almost no chance that Parliament will not endorse the move.

The two Governments are expected to move rapidly to establish formal ties. This will involve the question of where the West German Embassy will be. The Israelis want it in Jerusalem, but as a ranking official put it, "we are not going to fight about it."

All the major powers have established embassies in Tel Aviv to avoid conflict with a 1947 United Nations resolution that placed Jerusalem under international trusteeship. The situation became anachronistic after the Israel Government moved its offices to Jerusalem, which it maintains is Israel's capital, in 1950.

A number of countries, especially from Africa and Latin America, have embassies in Jerusalem. Bonn may do the same because it is technically not bound by the 1947 resolution as it is not a member of the U.N.

[From New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 17, 1965]

NASSER SPREAD THIN

President Gamal Abdel Nasser has been a busy man in these past few months. He has fomented war in the Congo, waged a humiliatingly inconclusive one in Yemen, and conducted a diplomatic game with West Germany which will probably have far-reaching effects. But how well the United Arab Republic has fared in all of this frenzied personal statecraft is another matter.

The steps by which Nasser arrived at an open break with Bonn show a perverse kind of cunning. First, Nasser pressured West Germany into ending its arms shipments to Israel—which might count as a gain for the Arab world. Then he flaunted a visit by Walter Ulbricht, of Communist East Germany, before all the nations. Except as a form of international impudence, this does not promise much for the United Arab Republic. And, when Bonn, in retaliation, sought diplomatic relations with Israel, Nasser declared that he would break both diplomatic and economic ties with the Federal Republic.

This would seem to be a plain case of cutting off the United Arab Republic's nose to spite its face, but Nasser tried to get the other Arab States to go along with him. Those of North Africa have very close ties with Western Europe; they apparently opposed any severe action against West Germany. The others seem to have agreed to recall their Ambassadors from Bonn, but not to recognize the Communist puppet Germany or break economically with West Germany.

In all, it is not clear what Nasser has done for his country, beyond driving West Germany and Israel closer together, just as France and Israel became partners after Nasser seized the Suez Canal. It is a curious series of episodes in the history of diplomacy and it suggests that Nasser is better at devising means of annoying other nations than of helping his own.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1965]

ISRAEL AND BONN

The Israel decision to accept West Germany's bid for formal diplomatic relations is a constructive move that benefits both sides. It also helps clear the international atmosphere. Earlier reports of Israeli conditions for normalizing relations raised possibilities that could have adversely affected the position of Chancellor Erhard's government, while providing ammunition for Israel's enemies.

As Israel Foreign Minister Golda Meir remarked last week, the West German suggestion that diplomatic relations be established produced a debate "between the head and the heart" for every Israeli. With memories of Hitler's mass murder of Jews still strong, it is understandable that there should be a carryover of emotional repugnance to the idea even two decades after nazism's overthrow. The decision to accept Bonn's offer, therefore, represents a victory for reason over emotion. Israel's international position and its economic prospects both stand to gain materially from closer ties with West Germany, and these considerations properly proved decisive.

The confusion already reigning in Arab ranks testifies to Chancellor Erhard's wisdom in deciding to counter Egypt's welcome to Walter Ulbricht by the positive move of recognizing Israel rather than the negative one of breaking relations with Cairo. President Nasser was not serving any Arab interest when he received the East German leader, and the result of his action has already brought open criticism of him from Tunisian President Bourguiba.

Nasser's recent threats against Bonn represent a form of attempted blackmail that can only increase West German resentment. Many Arab leaders whose prestige is less personally involved than that of the Egyptian strong man can easily calculate that their countries would suffer substantially from a break in relations with Bonn. They are hardly likely to want to bear the costs of his folly.

President Nasser did not plan it that way, but at this moment Israel and West Germany appear to be the prime beneficiaries of his blundering venture into international gamesmanship.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 15, 1965]

ISRAEL ACCEPTS TIES WITH BONN: ISRAEL ACCEPTS TIES WITH WEST GERMANY

(By Richard Chesnoff)

JERUSALEM.—Israel's Government decided yesterday to accept West Germany's offer to establish full diplomatic relations immediately.

With two abstentions, Premier Levi Eshkol's coalition cabinet voted unanimously for the ties. The Ahdut Haavoda Socialist ministers refrained from voting pending their party's official decision today.

Despite international reports to the contrary, informed Jerusalem sources said yesterday that Israel and West Germany had reached "basic agreement" on the major issues outstanding between them.

These sources reiterated last week's report from Israel that West Germany had agreed to fulfill—perhaps through a "third party"—an arms-shipment deal cut off last month under pressure from President Nasser of Egypt.

Foreign Ministry sources said the formal exchange of ambassadors between Israel and West Germany would now "move swiftly."

Mr. Eshkol will present the government verdict to the Knesset (Parliament) tomorrow. Political observers said that although some fervent opposition to the move is expected, Mr. Eshkol is assured of a minimum of 65 percent Knesset backing.

The Cabinet Secretary said Mr. Eshkol told the Cabinet: "There is a basis for hope to find agreed settlement on outstanding questions."

Other sources, said Mr. Eshkol, were "quite satisfied" with the results of his secret talks last week with West German Chancellor Erhard's special envoy, Kurt Birrenbach. The emissary is expected to return from Bonn Wednesday to continue the negotiations.

When he goes later this month for talks with British Prime Minister Wilson, Mr. Eshkol may stop for talks with Chancellor Erhard.

The $80 million, American-backed arms deal with Israel was halted by Bonn after threats by President Nasser to recognize the East German Communist regime if the shipments continued. The cutoff strained Bonn's informal relations with Israel but did not succeed in halting Cairo's friendly moves toward East Germany.

The Jerusalem sources said that Bonn, not wishing to antagonize the Arab States more than it has by recognizing Israel, might fulfill the unfinished portion of the arms deal—about $16 million worth—through a "third party."

Israel has steadfastly turned down Chancellor Erhard's offer of economic compensation for the arms halt.

As to the future, Bonn reportedly has offered Israel an extensive, no-strings-attached economic grant but has not acceded to an Israel request for direct Bonn military aid beyond the original deal.

CAIRO.—Israel's decision to accept a West German proposal to establish diplomatic relations threw the Cairo conference of 13 Arab Foreign Ministers into turmoil yesterday, conference sources reported.

The ministers called their second recess of the day, still without a decision on any retaliatory steps taken against Bonn, after receiving a report of the Israeli Cabinet decision.

Conference sources said the report provoked a "heated discussion," with at least four Foreign Ministers urging their colleagues not to vote for reprisals beyond the power of the Arab world to implement.

President Nasser has urged the Arab States to break diplomatic and economic relations with Bonn and recognize Communist East Germany if Bonn establishes relations with Israel. Saturday night he said Egypt would take these measures regardless of what the other Arab States did.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sentinel, Mar. 11, 1965]

BONN MAKES CONCILIATORY MOVES TOWARD ISRAEL—ERHARD SAYS HE WILL STOP ALL AID AND CREDITS TO NASSER

BONN (JTA).—Chancellor Ludwig Erhard, in an official statement issued to the press, announced Sunday that the West German Government is ready to establish diplomatic relations with Israel and to compensate Israel for the rest of the promised arms aid which was cut off after a protest from Egypt. The statement also said that the Bonn government will stop all economic aid and further credits to Egypt.

The statement emphasized that the West German Government rejects any kind of intervention in her affairs, and particularly in her relationship with Israel. At the same time it pointed out that the granting of diplomatic recognition to Israel is not directed against any of the Arab States. The Chancellor's statement stressed that President Nasser has jeopardized the traditional German-Arab friendship and that the state visit by Premier Ulbricht of Communist East Germany to Egypt, at Nasser's invitation, is bound to influence this friendship.

The Chancellor's statement was read at an extraordinary press conference by State Secretary Karl-Gunther von Hase who declared that the Chancellor, empowered by the Federal Republic's constitution, has spelled out his government's foreign policy, as well as his own position. The statement made it clear that the policy has been formulated after consultation with Germany's principal allies—the United States, France and Britain. It noted that all of Germany's political parties represented in the Bonn Parliament have been informed of the policy statement.

(Official circles in Jerusalem told the Jewish Telegraphic Agency Sunday that the statement by Chancellor Erhard is a "surprise," in view of the Bonn government's position of the last week. Observers in Jerusalem wondered Sunday whether Dr. Erhard's mention of fulfilling his government's arms aid agreement with Israel meant that he was now ready to carry out the Israel-German pact and will resume Germany's arms deliveries upon which Israel insists.)

The statement concluded as follows: "After very careful consideration of the problems as a whole, and through weighing all possible developments, even those outside of the immediate interests of Germany in the Middle East, the Chancellor has decided:

"1. The invitation of Ulbricht by Egypt has been countered by the Federal Republic by the stopping of economic aid. This means the Federal Republic will not participate in Egypt's second 5-year plan. The Federal Government will not grant to Egypt any further capital aid, and refuses to grant Egypt any delays in the payment of Government-guaranteed debts due for long-period credits. Running obligations will be reconsidered, of course, in accordance with international law.

"2. That part of the German people living in the Soviet Zone has been deprived of the self-evident right to self-determination. The justification of this rule by force will be considered by the Federal Government of Germany an unfriendly act and countered in each case by appropriate measures.

"3. The Federal Republic of Germany wishes to establish diplomatic relations with Israel. This step is bound to normalize conditions. It is not directed against any Arab country.

"4. By its decision not to supply arms to areas of tension, and by deciding to compensate for the rest of deliveries pending, in agreement with Israel, the Federal Government has contributed considerably to the evolution of a clear Middle East policy. The Federal Government thinks it necessary to declare in this context that it rejects endeavors to influence its policy in this area particularly as regards its relations with Israel, be it the 'conflict partner' who tries to do so or whoever he may be.

"5. Together with its allies, who have repeatedly asked Germany to be responsible for peace and quiet in the Middle East, the Federal Republic will endeavor through its presence to diminish tensions."

GERMANS AND JEWS: EACH MUST LEARN TO FACE THE OTHER WITHOUT PREJUDICE

(NOTE.—This is one of the typical articles that appeared in the German press.)

LÜBECK, February 28.—It often seems as though we don't really want to overcome our past, but to overwhelm it. At the moment there are two matters in particular giving rise to this impression: Is the term of limitation for murder with respect to unpunished Nazi crimes to be extended or not? And: Is the Federal Republic bound to support Israel with weapons in its struggle for existence against the Arab states?

These are two questions that have divided the Germans to just about the same extent as they have prejudiced the rest of the world against the Federal Republic. In fact, full-page advertisements, discussing the betrayal of the nation toward which our guilt is

greatest, have been published by Jewish organizations in the United States. These are serious allegations, and written in blind anger. The German Ambassador in Washington has deplored them, and quite rightly.

UNTRUSTWORTHY

Yet just as serious as making allegations like this is to take the stand of a well-known Swiss newspaper, a paper that tends to favor us. It expresses the opinion that there is a feeling of discomfort in the world, a discomfort called Germany. It would hardly be possible at the moment to express more clearly and kindly the fact that we have once more managed to get ourselves a name for being untrustworthy and unreliable. We are beginning to look like the wicked Germans again, the people who can't be trusted an inch.

How has our political and moral standing managed to decline to such an extent? In the first place, the federal government has failed repeatedly and culpably to do the right thing. It hesitated when it was time to negotiate, or it finally reached a decision it more or less had to recall later. And the problems of the term of limitation and military aid to Israel have finally become classic examples of just this. In both cases, Dr. Erhard's cabinet was too quick to commit itself. It either did not want to see, or could not see, what the consequences of such rashness would be. In the matter involving the statute of limitations, the Federal Republic has already corrected its stand, but doubts about us still remain. Because we were the very ones to arouse them. And the same is true for the question of military aid to Israel. Intermediation is already being mentioned. And so it doesn't seem quite impossible that this particular Bonn decision may be corrected. On the one hand the Israelis are insisting that we fulfill our part of the secret treaty, and, on the other, Nasser has, according to the Hallstein Doctrine, become an enemy.

We have got ourselves caught in an embarrassing situation for which we ourselves are to blame. In the final analysis we shall only be able to get out of it by allowing more than we originally wanted to prevent. But the Federal Republic was not the only one to blame for the decline in our political and moral standing—a decline that is weakening our position considerably. The international pressure on Bonn, more conscious than unconscious, has contributed just as much to this as the wave of nationalism that is beginning to set in in the Federal Republic. These two factors are connected with one another, and each depends upon the other. The more strongly the pressure from outside makes itself felt, the more strongly is the counterpressure going to build up from within, and vice versa: a highly dangerous spiral in which we have got ourselves involved and to which the Federal Government has contributed. It wanted to break down nothing abroad and spoil nothing at home. It wanted to remain internationally reliable and nationally recognized. Yet, even in this, it has failed so far. It has perhaps never been so clear as it is at the moment that the relationship between the Germans and the Jews is a keystone of all our politics. The moral keystone particularly. This tends to be forgotten from time to time. The crimes against Jewish people during the Third Reich remain unparalleled. And the expiation for these crimes must, accordingly, be unparalleled, too. Recognizing these basic facts must overshadow any reference to our exemplary financial reparations, or the statement that we should at last be left in peace. Understandable though it is that many Germans want to close old accounts, wanting to do this sort of thing pays less politically than being able to do it. So we have to be satisfied with the fact that it just is not within our power to break with our past, and never will be. Not from our side, at least.

The Federal Republic and the nation itself have usually ignored this, because they are beginning to regard their past more and more as a curse. By saying he was willing, if necessary, to live in the same society as murderers, one of our most competent spokesmen, the Federal Minister of Justice, Mr. Bucher, of all people, damaged our reputation so much abroad that it will be difficult to repair. People abroad regard the question of the term of limitation not only as a legal one, but primarily as political and moral, and it is in this light that it should be discussed; morally we are bound to stand by it.

Confronting our unsubdued past unswervingly makes it difficult, of course, to deal with the present. It is unfair on many Germans that they should have to walk around like marked men. Neither East nor West make any distinction in the matter. Where the term of limitation is concerned, the East is enjoying the opportunity of seeing us dangle helplessly at the mercy of those who know they have us where they want us. And, in the matter of military aid to Israel, it was the West, the Americans mainly, who sent us to the Near East front to haul the chestnuts from the fire, knowing how dependent we are on America. It would have been incomparably better if we had not allowed ourselves to be sent, but had gone of our own accord.

NASSER'S BLACKMAIL

And in the Near East, there is only one answer now to Nasser's blackmail: to take up diplomatic relations with Israel. And if Israel, moreover, demands military aid from the Federal Republic of all countries, even this seems logical.

The young Jewish State is exposed to a deadly threat. Mr. Ben Gurion, long the Prime Minister of Israel, is responsible for the maxim that "All that matters is to insure the survival of the survivors." We may believe him, just as we might wish the world to believe him, when, as the most prominent of all Jews, he never tires of making a distinction between the Federal Republic and Hitler's Reich. His word may carry the greatest weight. But it is only when Germans and Jews have learned to face each other without embarrassment, that they will be able finally to settle their political misunderstandings without having to express their moral rearmament by drawing swastikas on synagogues, or calling for the boycott of German firms. It is still by our attitude to the Jews that we are going to be judged.

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF WATER RESEARCH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 116, S. 22, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 22) to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "with", to strike out "private firms and individuals" and insert "those private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, adequate for the conduct of water research projects"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 200 of Public Law 88-379 of the Eighty-eighth Congress is repealed and

(b) That there is enacted in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1966, increasing $1,000,000 annually for five years, and continuing at $10,000,000 annually thereafter from which he may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions; with those private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, adequate for the conduct of water research projects; and with local, State, or Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior, which may be deemed desirable and are not otherwise being studied."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what action has been taken on S. 22?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the word "with", to strike out "private firms and individuals" and insert "those private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, adequate for the conduct of water research projects".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill is in pretty much the same shape as when it was passed by the Senate a year or so ago. It went to the House, and the House took out one of the provisions, and made provision that the President had to report back to Congress the things done by way of water research contracts. The President was reluctant to sign it under the doctrine of Executive privilege. There was a long discussion about it. We told the President that, if he signed the bill, we would correct it. What comes to us is S. 22. It was reported unanimously by the Senate committee. I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, these amendments to the Water Resources Act of 1964 are a necessary step to insure that the provisions of the act will be better designed to carry out the program's worthy objective of insuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population.

These amendments would not change the purpose; but they would enlarge the scope of the program, and would remove some undesirable limitations from it. First, the title II authorization for grants, contracts, and matching arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations, and other in-

stitutions is changed from the $1 million a year of the original act to $5 million for the first year, increasing $1 million annually for 5 years, and continuing at $10 million annually thereafter.

Secretary Udall has notified the Senate that in the short life of the Office of Water Resources Research, 36 research proposals, totaling $1,750,000, have been received. This experience indicates that the $1 million ceiling is inadequate, and that the $5 million authorization for the first year is justified.

This bill wisely drops the provision prohibiting support of title II research at institutions where there is a title I water resources-research institute. These institutes will become the Nation's centers for this type of research; and to artificially restrict support for them flies in the face of the objectives of the act.

When President Johnson signed Senate bill 2, of the 88th Congress, into law, he requested the deletion of the provision giving the Senate and the House Interior Committees veto power over title II grants and contracts. As the President pointed out, such a provision "violates the spirit of the constitutional requirement of separation of power between the executive and legislative branches."

Now we are wisely deleting that provision.

Texas is one of the 28 States which will not have enough water by the year 2000 if current practices are continued. This program has widespread support in Texas. Six proposals from the Texas Water Resources Research Center have been submitted. These involve research into the water cycle, water and land management, and into qualitative, economic, and institutional aspects of water resources research.

The whole future of the southwestern part of the United States is vitally dependent upon water. No sounder investment of public funds can be made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AND CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 117, S. 560. It will not take much time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 560) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended, and the Clean Air Act, as amended, to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Installations, Facilities, and Equipment Pollution Control Act".

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 101. Section 9 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466h), is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 9." and by adding at the end of such section the following:

"(b) In order to prevent or control water pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall discharge wastes therefrom only in compliance with standards for such discharges as are established by the Secretary. Such standards applicable in any State shall (1) be established after consultation with appropriate officials of such State with respect thereto, (2) be consistent to the extent possible with any standards established by the Federal Government, by such State or by the municipality where applicable, and (3) not require a lesser degree of pollution control than such Federal, State, or municipal standards. The Secretary or his duly authorized representative is authorized to enter any such building, installation, or other property at reasonable times for the purpose of inspecting and investigating waste discharge practices.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated necessary amounts to be expended for the installation, maintenance, and operation in Federal buildings, installations, and other property of waste disposal systems which are certified by the Secretary to have been designed in accordance with the standards promulgated under subsection (b). Such amounts shall be appropriated to the Federal departments or agencies concerned. Any Federal department or agency having under its jurisdiction any building, installation, or other property which does not meet standards established pursuant to subsection (b) shall request from the Congress such appropriations as may be necessary to comply with such standards.

"(d) No building, installation, or other property shall be constructed, otherwise prepared for use, or expanded by any Federal department or agency after the effective date of this subsection unless such construction, preparation, or expansion includes waste disposal practices determined by the Secretary to be adequate for the purposes of this section.

"(e) In order to assist in assuring appropriate maintenance and operation of waste disposal systems, the Secretary shall provide training in such matters to personnel of any Federal department or agency, at the request of the head of such department or agency.

"(f) Each Federal department or agency shall, not later than one year after the effective date of this section, report to the Secretary the waste disposal practices in effect at buildings, installations, and other property under its jurisdiction. The Secretary shall make a report to the President and the Congress not later than eighteen months after the effective date of this section, with respect to (1) Federal buildings, installations, and other property not in compliance with standards established pursuant to subsection (b) prior to the date of such report, (2) any reasons for such noncompliance, and (3) the Secretary's recommendations as to what action should be taken in order to accomplish compliance. The Secretary shall make a report to the President and the Congress each January 1 thereafter with respect to the effectiveness of actions taken by Federal departments and agencies to prevent and control waste pollution."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS OF CLEAN AIR ACT

SEC. 201. Section 6 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857e) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) Effective on and after October 1, 1966, no Federal department or agency shall purchase any automotive vehicle unless such vehicle is manufactured or equipped to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants from its exhaust in accordance with standards established by the Secretary. In establishing such standards, the Secretary may exempt special purpose vehicles from the provisions of this subsection."

SEC. 202. Section 7 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857f) is amended—

(1) by striking out the last sentence in subsection (b); and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated necessary amounts to be expended for the installation, maintenance, and operation in Federal buildings, installations, and other property of such devices as are certified by the Secretary to be adequate for the purposes of subsection (b). Such amounts shall be appropriated to the Federal departments or agencies concerned. Any Federal department or agency having under its jurisdiction any building, installation, or other property not in compliance with requirements established pursuant to subsection (b) shall request from the Congress such appropriations as may be necessary to accomplish compliance.

"(d) No building, installation, or other property shall be constructed, otherwise prepared for use, or expanded by any Federal department or agency after the effective date of this subsection unless such construction, preparation, or expansion includes air pollution control measures determined by the Secretary to be adequate for the purposes of this section.

"(e) In order to assist in assuring appropriate maintenance and operation of devices or other means of prevention or control of air pollution, the Secretary shall provide training in such matters to personnel of any Federal department or agency at the request of the head of such department or agency.

"(f) Each Federal department or agency shall keep the Secretary informed of air pollution control practices in effect at buildings, installations, and other property under its jurisdiction and shall promptly inform the Secretary of the absence of, or failure to institute practices necessary and adequate for the purposes of this section and the reason or reasons therefor. The Secretary shall report each January to the President and to the Congress on the status and effectiveness of actions taken under this section to prevent and control air pollution by such Federal departments and agencies.

"(g) The Secretary or his duly authorized representative is authorized to enter any such building, installation, or other property at reasonable times for the purpose of inspecting and investigating air pollution control practices."

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be considered as new text for the purpose of amendment.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I offer two technical amendments to S. 560, as amended. These are to insert the word "subsection" instead of the word "section" on page 7, line 25, and on page 8, line 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Senate bill 560, designated as the Federal Installations, Facilities, and Equipment Control Act, introduced by myself and 15 cosponsors, would provide a more effective basis for the control of water and air pollution from Federal buildings, installations, or other property. It would also provide that automotive vehicles purchased by the Federal Government, on and after October 1, 1966, be manufactured or equipped to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants from exhaust emissions. Certain special-purpose vehicles would be exempt from this provision.

I want to note at this point that devices have been tested and approved which are replacements for elements of the exhaust systems and which reduce harmful exhaust emissions. Also, the automobile industry has indicated that certain engine modifications that are commercially practicable could be made to reduce exhaust emissions.

The legislation was first suggested by the ranking minority member of the subcommittee [Mr. BOGGS]. As in the case of other pollution control legislation, he has played a leading and constructive role in the development of this bill.

Briefly, S. 560, as reported by the Committee on Public Works, provides the following:

First. Establishes a procedure for setting standards for allowable discharges of waterborne waste from Federal installations.

Second. Authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make necessary inspections and investigations of waste discharge practices.

Third. Authorizes funds to install, maintain, and operate works to control water pollution and directs appropriate agencies to request necessary funds.

Fourth. Requires that all new or expanded installations include facilities to attain desirable degree of waste pollution control.

Fifth. Authorizes training of personnel to operate and maintain waste treatment works.

Sixth. Establishes a system for periodic reports to the President and the Congress on waste treatment control programs in Federal installations.

Seventh. Provides for automotive emission standards to be applied to all federally purchased automotive vehicles after October 1, 1966. Certain special-purpose vehicles may be exempted.

Eighth. Authorizes funds to install, maintain, and operate air pollution control devices and directs the appropriate agencies to request necessary funds.

Ninth. Requires that all new or expanded installations include air pollution control measures.

Tenth. Authorizes training of personnel to operate and maintain devices or other means of controlling air pollution.

Eleventh. Establishes a system for periodic reports to the President and the Congress on air pollution control practices and the effectiveness of actions taken.

Twelfth. Authorizes Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to inspect and investigate air pollution control practices at Federal installations.

These expanded areas of Federal activity are essential to a meaningful national water and air pollution control program.

It would be less than fair if we require, through Federal legislation, that States, municipalities, corporations, and private individuals adhere to antipollution practices and not require the same degree of attention to the problems of water and air pollution by our Federal agencies.

Much attention has been given to the water and air pollution problems by our Federal agencies; however, there is no real coordinated direction on their part in reducing the problem. Many agencies are operating under a variety of directives and instructions, but there is no direct congressional mandate to install the necessary waste treatment facilities, nor has any particular agency been designated to take the lead in assuring that proper action is taken. Most agencies are preoccupied with the problems of their basic mission and are unwilling or unable to obtain funds to correct the problems of water and air pollution.

The committee has been told by a number of State officials of their frustrations in attempting to have Federal agencies provide waste treatment works to meet desirable water quality standards, while at the same time, under their State laws, they have required that municipalities, corporations, and State-controlled institutions carry out practices designed to correct the problem. This same situation exists with respect to air pollution problems, although to a lesser extent because the air pollution program is only in its infancy. Nonetheless, coordinated direction needs to be given to the prevention and control of air pollutants from Federal installations.

With respect to the problem of controlling air pollution resulting from automotive vehicle exhausts, I would like to commend the General Services Administration for their forward-looking action in specifying exhaust standards to be met by certain types of vehicles purchased by it after October 1, 1966. However, there are other Federal agencies who have their own purchasing authority, and they, too, should be required to specify that exhaust emissions be controlled to desirable limits. Also, there needs to be a centralized Federal authority to study effects of emissions and means of controlling them.

The committee is aware that certain types of military vehicles, such as tanks and other combat vehicles, and certain types of vehicles used for civilian purposes should be exempt from the application of standards, since the control of emissions is not possible, practicable, or necessary. Also, at this time sufficient research has not been made to determine the extent of the effect of emissions from diesel-powered vehicles, nor means of effectuating control. Therefore, a provision has been included which would allow exemptions from standards in special instances.

It is my belief that this legislation is a meaningful step in the right direction on the road to more effective water and air pollution control and a healthy environment for all of us. I urge its passage by the Senate.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I would like to concur in the remarks just made by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], relative to S. 560, a bill to provide for improved control of air and water pollution from Federal installations and facilities.

Since the first water pollution control legislation was enacted during President Eisenhower's administration, each administration has recognized the role and responsibility of the Federal Government in pollution control. Unfortunately, while the Federal Government has provided moneys and technical assistance to States and municipalities for water pollution control, they have been somewhat less diligent in requiring Federal installations and facilities to control pollution.

As a result, in some instances fine efforts to clean up our streams have gone for naught as the result of a Federal installation continuing to pour inadequately treated wastes into the Nation's streams. This bill, Mr. President, for the first time provides the mechanism and the congressional mandate for Federal agencies to take affirmative action to control both air and water pollution at their installations

Mr. President, I am glad to be a cosponsor of this bill and desire to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MUSKIE] for all his interest and work in developing this bill.

I think this legislation is needed. It will be helpful. I urge that it be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Clean Air Act in order to provide for improved control of water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and automotive vehicles."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have been listening to and reading with

a sense of shocked incredulity the explanation by the Attorney General of the United States to the President's proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965. Not since the time of the enactment of the Force Acts in Reconstruction Days has such a heinous and oppressive measure been advanced in the Congress of the United States, directed solely and alone against certain Southern States. The States of Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, and Georgia, to the greatest degree, and those of South Carolina, Virginia, and North Carolina, to a lesser degree, are to be tried, convicted, and sentenced by the administration, through the instrumentality of the Attorney General, with the consent of Congress. The constitutional rights and privileges of the people and the constitutions and laws of the States are to be nullified, abridged, and supplanted, insofar as voter qualifications are concerned. The Constitution of the United States is crystal clear. The States, and only the States, have the power and the right to fix the qualifications of voters residing therein. The Supreme Court of the United States has said time and time again that a literacy test requiring interpretation of sections of State constitutions or understanding of the duties and obligations of citizenship is a reasonable and just exercise of State sovereignty. It is now proposed that all voter qualifications prescribed by either constitutions or statute in Mississippi and other named Southern States be supplanted by qualifications to be set by an arbitrary determination of the United States Attorney General, and it is apparent that the most he will require will be that a person be 21 years of age and a citizen and resident of Mississippi. Not only an illiterate, but one absolutely lacking in all of the attributes of good moral character, or any moron not incarcerated in an institution can be qualified to vote under the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana are being singled out and penalized primarily because they have exercised their constitutional right to disagree with laws enacted by the Congress of the United States or laws passed by the Supreme Court of the United States and decided that they would litigate the enforcement of these laws through every court in every jurisdiction and in any manner and form that it was possible for human ingenuity to design to fight the ultimate determination of their validity and their enforcement by a final court decree. Thank God, Mississippi fought and is still fighting the constitutionality and application of certain of the provisions of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964. If Congress does not somehow take the power of litigation and access to the courts away from our State, we are going to continue to fight what we consider to be the unconstitutional provisions that are inherent in this legislation. But now we have apparently fought, according to the administration and the Attorney General, not wisely, but too well. The judicial processes, even with loaded courts, are inadequate to inflict upon the people of the States herein mentioned the Federal Government's ideas as to what constitutes discrimination in voting registration practices on the grounds of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. I deny that either Congress or the Attorney General has any constitutional power to make a judicial determination that the State of Mississippi has violated the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and that Congress has both the power and right to put the Attorney General in the place of the legislature and constitution of the State of Mississippi and let him arbitrarily fix the voter qualifications of all the people of Mississippi, both black and white.

This is an insult not only to the white people of the State of Mississippi, but also to those numerous members of our Negro population who, as responsible citizens, have qualified to vote and have voted over a long period of time. Even if there had been in the past some indications or evidence of a denial or abridgement of the right to vote on the part of any individual in Mississippi by reason of his race or color, there is no justification or logic in taking a position that two wrongs make a right, and rather than have a uniform application of a reasonable literacy test against both white and Negro applicants, all literacy tests will be nullified and both literates and illiterates of each race will be registered just as fast as they can run to either a Federal examiner appointed under the direction of the Attorney General by the Civil Service Commission or a Mississippi circuit clerk, the duly constituted registrant under Mississippi law.

Mr. President, how could this Congress conceivably enact legislation that was specifically designed to apply to only 6 or 7 States of the Union and leave the other 43 or 44 free from its application? This is inconceivable under any theory of equal protection of the laws and even-handed justice and application of law. I charge, Mr. President, that a criteria was deliberately built to achieve this result, and it was so designed that States such as Texas could be omitted from its application. Also, the State of New York seems to be omitted, either through legal legerdemain or because the Attorney General does not have any reason to believe that there is any such thing as discrimination existing within the confines of that State. New York has a literacy test. In lieu of taking the test, it is required that one produce a certificate showing an eighth grade education. New York also grossly discriminates against non-English speaking Puerto Rican citizens by requiring literacy in English. Yet it is said that New York is not covered by the bill.

The bill has a strange nomenclature and language all of its own. It condemns States which it alleges employ tests or devices as some sort of alleged technique to discriminate against a class in the registration and voting processes. Tests and devices are defined as:

First. Demonstration of the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter.

Second. Demonstrate any educational achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject.

Third. Possess good moral character, or

Fourth. Prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class.

Now, according to the Attorney General's calculation, there are a total of 22 States, both North and South, that have in their constitution or laws regarding voter qualifications one or more of the tests or devices above enumerated. Therefore, they had to devise some system for eliminating all but the States they wanted to put the knife in. So the next gimmick is an arbitrary one that goes back to November 1964 and provides that where a State has any one of these tests or devices as a qualification for voting 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 on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964, then that State or political subdivision would come within the terms of the bill. This formula was designed to catch Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and 34 counties in North Carolina. It does so because of the fact that the Southern States have traditionally voted a smaller percentage of the total population than the more populous areas of the East, Midwest, and West. If Mississippi desires to employ a literacy test which requires a reasonably intelligent understanding of government and the duties and obligations of citizenship, she has a constitutional right to do so; and if this should disqualify residents—white or black—so be it. Furthermore, voter apathy is neither a moral nor a constitutional sin, and there is not, and never has been, a constitutional requirement in this country that every citizen is required to vote. The privilege of not voting is just as great and just as sacred as the privilege of exercising the ballot, although all responsible citizens should exercise their privilege of suffrage.

Now, let us consider further the percentages of voting population who cast ballots in the 1964 presidential election. In the first place, Southern States have always been primarily a one-party State and have never been in the habit of casting as many votes in Federal elections as they do in their primary elections, when the local, county, parish, and State officers are up for election. Alaska is caught in the toils, but there will be no penalties against Alaska because only 49 percent of her population voted in the 1964 election. Arizona has tests and devices, but it was eliminated because 55 percent of its population voted. California has tests and devices. It was eliminated because 65 percent of its population of voting age voted, and on down the line of Eastern States.

I do not believe that this proposed formula has any meaning or substance whatsoever. It was designed solely and alone because it would embrace the States and only the States that the Attorney General wished covered. As to political subdivisions of States, when the figures are furnished to us, I believe that it will be revealed there is just as much voter apathy in Harlem, in the South Side in Chicago, in the black belt of Philadelphia, and in the Negro wards of Los Angeles as there is right here in the District of Columbia and throughout the South, where there is a heavy concentration of Negro population; and I propose, Mr. President, before any final votes are taken on the passage of this bill, to see that amendments are offered so that if it passes, it will not be class legislation that grossly discriminates against a few States and does not apply to others. Furthermore, I challenge the entire basis of any retroactive formula that is devised on figures provided by the Director of the Census for the year 1964. There was no census in 1964, and there is no manner or technique of any kind or character by which the Director of the Census can make an honest and true statement as to the number of persons of voting age who were residents of any State or any political subdivision of a State on November 1, 1964. This was more than 4 years after the 1960 census, and I am sure that the Director of the Census himself is going to admit that his estimate is subject to errors of great magnitude. Such evidence would not be worth the spoken words in a court of law as to a situation that existed in November 1964. It was as early as 1849 when the Supreme Court of the United States held that the census of 1840 could not be taken as evidence of the number of freeholders in a State in 1842. I propose that this and many other matters will be given full and careful scrutiny while this bill is being considered, and I predict that when the American people come to the realization of what a monstrous crime is being perpetrated in the name of the 15th amendment against the people of a limited number of Southern States, they will rise up in horror and urge the repudiation of this unconstitutional type of vindictive legislation.

Mr. President, the draftsmen of this bill so distrust the people in the affected Southern States that the doors of the local Federal courts are forever closed to them in raising any legal issues as to the application of the terms of the legislation. The one court, the only court, that is given any jurisdiction to entertain suits concerning the validity and application of the proposed law is the district court for the District of Columbia. The Federal trial judges, and the Federal appellate judges for Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, and Georgia are not to be trusted. Litigants much travel hundreds and even thousands of miles to reach a court in which they can enter. It has been known for years that an appointee could not be considered for the District bench unless he had the wholehearted endorsement of the NAACP. But so far as Mississippi is concerned, neither this State nor any political subdivision could even get into this court for a period of more than 10 years in order to prove it is not guilty of violations of the act. The bill reverses established legal process and requires that the party charged with an offense prove himself not guilty.

The Wall Street Journal has recently published two splendid editorials condemning the proposed legislation in all of its aspects, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 22, 1965]

AN IMMORAL LAW

When President Johnson last Monday asked Congress for a new law to safeguard the voting rights of Negro citizens he rested his case on the Constitution and on a basic principle of morality.

What he has now proposed that the Congress do is enact a law which would violate that Constitution he asks us not to flout and, more, which is itself immoral.

If you think not so, consider:

The administration bill offers a formula—a complicated one, which we will come to in a moment—to prohibit certain States from using any test of a citizen's ability to read and write our language as a qualification for voting.

The argument for doing this is the 15th amendment to the Constitution which provides, clearly enough, that neither the Federal Government nor any State shall deprive a citizen of his vote "on account of" his race or color.

But the proposed bill does not stop with providing a means against the violation of the 15th amendment. It does not aim at insuring that any such State literacy test shall be fairly drawn and impartially administered so that it may not be used as an excuse to deprive anyone of his vote "on account of" his race.

The effect—and indeed the purpose—would be to abolish such tests entirely in the affected States. And that flies squarely in the face of this selfsame Constitution which the President professes to uphold.

The very first article of that Constitution authorizes the individual States to decide the qualifications of voters in both Federal and State elections, subject only to the proviso that whoever is deemed qualified to vote for "the most numerous branch of the State legislature" is automatically qualified to vote in Federal elections.

Making this a State function was no casual decision. It was reaffirmed in identical language in the 17th amendment—adopted, incidentally, more than 40 years after the 15th amendment—which provided that all such qualifications should be impartially applied among all citizens.

This principle in the Constitution has been repeatedly upheld and affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, not merely in dusty antiquity but as recently as 1959 by judges presently sitting upon that bench.

Now we are well aware that there are a good many people, and perhaps the President is included, who oppose any literacy requirement. They say that a man's illiteracy is irrelevant to the question of having his judgment counted in public affairs. No man can quarrel with the right of such people to argue their case and, if persuasive, to alter the Constitution so as to prohibit them.

But the requirement that voters be able to read and write is by no means restricted to those Southern States now the object of this special legislation. Many others—including New York State—require that qualification, as the Constitution entitles them to do.

If it is immoral, as the President says, to deprive a qualified citizen of his right to vote "under color of a literacy test," is it moral to violate one part of the Constitution under the color of upholding another which is in no wise in conflict?

Nor does the question end there, for what this bill proposes to do is to set up a double standard. Some States would be permitted to keep their literacy requirement. Others would not.

The formula prescribed is that of a ratio between the number of persons of voting age within a State and the number of voters in an election. If 50 percent or more of the voting age inhabitants do vote, then the State is absolved. The Federal authorities will keep out, and the State may set its own qualifications for voters, including literacy tests. Otherwise, no.

This formula has been carefully devised so that in practice it is expected to apply only to six States, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia. In these States the Federal authorities would not only have the right to supervise voter registration but to abolish the voter qualifications they don't like.

A few moments reflection on this formula will suggest such weird paradoxes, and the possibility of such strange discriminations, as to stagger the mind.

A minor one is that a strict application of the formula would probably make it applicable to Alaska. However, a way has been devised to exempt it, which as much as anything suggests that the intent is not to write a general rule of law but to subject certain States to special laws.

Not so minor, but certainly weird, is the provision that a person once registered as a voter by the Federal authorities will be stricken from the list if he fails to vote "at least once during three consecutive years while listed." In short, you have to vote or you can't.

Of more consequence is the fact that if we have this law a citizen, white or Negro, can be entitled to a vote in Alabama no matter how illiterate he is, or for that matter even if he is a moron. But if the same citizen, white or Negro, lives in New York State he will not be entitled to vote.

This would create a truly ingenious paradox. The illiterate citizen, Negro or otherwise, would find himself with more "rights" in Alabama and her five outcast sister States than in the great State of New York. More, the educational level of the voting citizens of Alabama, the low level of which is part of the general complaint against it by civil rights leaders, would be further reduced. And this by Federal sanction.

Unfortunately, the irony is not funny. Beneath the paradox lies a serious question. Is it moral that our national laws should apply one rule to one State and another to another, requiring that the people of one State abolish qualifications for voters while the people of another State may uphold their standards?

Nor is that the end of the consequences of that weird formula. Recall that it permits the Federal Government to put all this machinery in motion, the takeover of the whole voting procedure by Federal authorities, only when the voting percentage of a State falls below 50 percent of the voting age population. If there was ever a device open to what President Johnson calls manipulation, this is it.

So long as a State contrives that one-half of its adults vote, it is free of the formula. This will not be overlooked by ingenious men who can contrive many things when justice is measured by percentages.

And this brings us to what we think is the fundamental immorality of this proposed law, unintentioned though it may be by those who drew it.

Any citizen, white or Negro, has the right to be treated by the law like all other citizens. If he has to meet qualifications to vote—age or any other—they must be only the qualifications asked of all. If he qualifies like any other he has the right to vote, and to deny him that right is to deny him what is inalienably his.

It makes no difference whether 99 percent of his neighbors vote or whether only 20 percent do. It makes no difference whether he has voted in the last three elections, or in none at all before he presents himself at the polls. His right is to vote or not vote as he pleases.

That is the whole of the moral issue. And the whole duty of government, insofar as it touches this matter, is to see that all equally can exercise this right.

The constitutional duty of the Federal Government is to see that this right is not abridged—anywhere, populous States or sparse States, Northern States or Southern States, where many go to the polls or where few take the trouble to. The means of assuring this—everywhere—is what any Federal voting law ought to do, and all it ought to do.

To play with complicated formulas, to measure justice by percentages, and to aim punitive laws at some States, not only violates both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution but buries the real moral question in sophistry.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 24, 1965]

A QUESTION OF PERVERSION

When the Attorney General began his explanation and defense of the proposed Federal voting bill he adopted a fascinating line of reasoning that deserves more attention than it seems to be getting.

Appearing before a Senate Judiciary subcommittee, Mr. Katzenbach made no claim that the Constitution gives to the Federal Government the authority to set voting qualifications in all the several States, nor did he cite any Supreme Court opinions to suggest that the Federal Government has this power.

He hardly could have. For the very first article of the Constitution—reaffirmed by the 17th amendment—lays down only one qualification which the national Government may insist upon, namely that all voters qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of any State legislature must be qualified also to vote in any national election.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution adds one other, and a very important one. It is that no State may take away the voting rights of any citizen "on account of" his race or color. And the 24th amendment bars poll taxes as a requirement for voting.

In short, then, the Constitution says this: No State may set higher qualifications for voting in Federal elections than in State ones, that no poll taxes shall be levied, and that every citizen must be treated equally by the voting laws of each State. Within that framework, each State is free to establish its own qualifications as to age, length of residence, literacy and the like.

This view has been consistently affirmed by the Supreme Court. Only 8 years ago, in a case specifically involving a literacy test in North Carolina, the Court repeated that "the States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised." The limitation on that power, in the Court's words, is that they cannot authorize "the discrimination which the Constitution condemns."

So to justify a Federal law to override State voting requirements and permit the Federal Government to eliminate literacy requirements in some States, Mr. Katzenbach had to adopt the line of reasoning that the abuse of a principle condemns the whole principle.

That is, he argues that the Federal Government, under color of the 15th amendment, has the authority to override the constitutional right of some States because literacy tests "have been perverted to test not literacy, not ability, not understanding—but race." And this is sufficient reason for the Federal Government to eliminate them entirely wherever such perversion has taken place.

This argument, please note, is quite different from an argument for a Federal law requiring that all literacy tests be fair and equitable and that Federal authorities be authorized, wherever necessary, to see that it is so.

The fact that literacy tests can be fair and equitable, in fact, is conceded; the literacy test of New York State will be left untouched, as will those in a number of other States. But the distinction is not made on an examination of the individual merits, judicially measured, of such tests. The merits or demerits would be measured, under this law, by how many people vote.

On Mr. Katzenbach's line of reasoning the Congress could have abolished poll taxes—surely a thing susceptible to abuse—by simple statute instead of, as was properly done, by constitutional amendment.

Indeed, on this line of reasoning the fact that police powers are sometimes abused by local policemen—and they certainly are—would become an argument not for halting the abuse but for eliminating the local police powers.

For our own part, we have no reason to doubt that in some places the constitutional principle under which each State sets its own voting requirement has been perverted to deny some people the voting rights they are entitled to. And we agree that this is a strong argument for national action to remedy those abuses, wherever occurring.

But if that is also an argument for altering the Constitution in unconstitutional fashion, then what the Attorney General of the United States is saying is that one perversion justifies another.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, it is going to take hours and even days to properly analyze and explain the iniquitous features that are contained in this proposed legislation. Under the flag of the 15th amendment, it is proposed that copious portions of both the body and amendments to the Constitution, before and after the 15th, be nullified and set aside. I earnestly ask that every Member of this body, even those who have signed as cosponsors of the bill, keep an open mind and carefully hear the arguments, constitutional, legal, and moral, that we will make against the bill. Do not be a party to placing an incubus such as this on a handful of States and people, to the exclusion of all others. When this kind of legislation is finalized, the republican form of government guaranteed to every State of the Union under the Constitution will be wholly and completely destroyed.

SENATOR COOPER'S VIEWS ON THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has expressed very pertinent and forthright views on our foreign aid program, in an article written by Mr. Dick Kirkpatrick, which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer on March 14.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

TIME FOR GOOD, HARD LOOK: THE UNITED STATES HAS LOST CONTROL OF FOREIGN AID, COOPER SAYS

(By Dick Kirkpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, former Ambassador to India and a friend of foreign aid, is one of those who believe Uncle Sam has lost control of the foreign aid program and ought to do something drastic to get back the reins.

Nations have grown to rely on the special assistance grants and the foreign aid loans (up to 40 years and starting at 1 percent interest in the first 10 years). Any suggestion to cut back drastically brings a bite on the hand that Uncle Sam extends to feed the biter.

And especially any major change in a troublesome country, such as Egypt, may bring screams that Uncle Sam is interfering with the nation's internal affairs, threats to do something about the Suez Canal, or threats to deal with the Communist bloc.

In an effort to help get Uncle Sam's hands off the bear he is holding by the tail, Senator COOPER last December suggested that President Johnson simply stop the entire foreign aid program throughout the world, except perhaps in South America.

Such a halt would give the United States time to review the aid program, without charges of cantankerous nations that the move was aimed at them or their internal affairs.

It definitely would put Uncle Sam back in the driver's seat, while making the review. At the same time, it would not bring the foreign aid program to a complete halt since current commitments still would continue—and there is an estimated $7.5 billion in foreign aid pipelines (that is, in process), or enough for a couple years of operation.

Since World War II, including the Marshall plan, American foreign aid has totaled $115 billion. Some repayments are dribbling in on loans—last year there was approximately $100 million repaid.

President Johnson in January submitted a $3.38 billion foreign aid program for fiscal 1966. It was the lowest request since the program began in 1946 and reflected the White House's sensitivity to the growing trend to whittle down the aid program as congressional and taxpayer gripes about it mount.

The trouble with foreign aid comes when the nation begins spending American dollars for purposes against U.S. interests—such as when Egypt uses American dollars to help its developmental projects, and uses its own resources to supply rebels in some of the emerging African nations.

But then, if the American aid were withdrawn, Uncle Sam would be accused of attaching "strings" to his aid, trying to interfere with the independence of the nation, when technically the aid is a "loan" that is supposed to be paid back with interest and, therefore, bears no other obligations.

President Johnson has not responded to Senator COOPER's suggestion to halt any new aid programs while taking a good look.

Oddly enough, President Johnson went out of his way a year ago to announce the adoption of another Cooper proposal—only nothing more has been done about it.

For years Senator COOPER has been backing authority for the President to appoint advisory committees to make a country-by-country study of the foreign aid program, to review its effectiveness.

When he presented his foreign aid program early in 1964 President Johnson did an

almost unprecedented thing in referring to Senator COOPER by name and said a general advisory committee was being named.

At the time, President Johnson said it was hoped that at least four or five country reviews, including two or three in Latin America, would be completed in 1964.

But, no such committee ever was appointed.

Senator COOPER said the United States should not be concerned by the furor created if further funds were halted.

"It would simply let all countries know that our aid program, established for good purposes, is our program and not theirs; that it is not fair to our people who must pay the bill, or to their people who are its objects, unless it is used effectively; and as a nation which has shown restraint and decency in its international relations, that we have the right to expect the same treatment and respect."

In any event, Senator COOPER contended, Uncle Sam should not let any nation "blackmail" the United States with threats to get rejected American aid from the Communist bloc. He said such nations should be told the United States is not out to outdeal Russia, but to help develop a reasonable 5-year program of assistance.

"The countries we aid will respect us for insisting upon these conditions, for they will be benefited, and without loss of any independence," he said.

EIGHTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF JUDGE FLORENCE ELLINWOOD ALLEN

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I had intended to deliver these remarks on the Senate floor on Tuesday, March 23, the appropriate date; but, without forewarning, the Senate adjourned from Monday, March 22, to Thursday, March 25. Belatedly, therefore, it is with much pleasure and respect that I call to the attention of Senators the fact that Tuesday, March 23, 1965, marked the 81st birthday anniversary of the Honorable Judge Florence Ellinwood Allen, one of the most able and distinguished jurists of our time.

In 1934, Florence Allen was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. She became the chief judge of the court in 1958, and is now senior judge of that court. At the time of that appointment, she was a judge of the Supreme Court of Ohio, and had served as a judge of that court for 12 years, since 1922. Previously, she had been, since 1920, a judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Cuyahoga County, in Cleveland.

Judge Allen is the first and the only woman to receive appointment to a U.S. Court of Appeals and to become the chief judge of a Court of Appeals. She is widely recognized as an eminent jurist and an authority on the constitutional law of the United States and in the broad field of international law.

She has received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from 25 colleges and universities; and she received the Albert Gallatin Medal, the highest award of New York University, from which she received the bachelor of laws degree in 1913.

Her early ancestors were among the first 1,000 inhabitants of the land which a century and a half ago was known as "the land 'way out west in Ohio."

On her paternal side, she is a descendant of Ethan Allen, the American Revolutionary soldier who heroically led the Green Mountain Boys in the capture of Fort Ticonderoga. Her maternal ancestors have their source in Dr. Samuel Fuller, of *Mayflower* time and fame. They were men and women of toil who helped to clear the forests and build our hamlets and towns. They bore the scars of toil and war, and shared in the joys that came with triumph. They were teachers in our schools, educated in the classics and the arts.

However, she need not call upon the noble deeds of her ancestors to add luster to her achievements. Through work, integrity, study, courage, and a gifted mind in a troubled and difficult world, she has brought glory to the Allen name. She need not take from ancestral graves the glory her forebears had won. By the force of her own character and the product of her individual toil, she has earned the laureled wreath of fame.

Although she was born in Utah, her forebears settled in the Western Reserve, which became the State of Ohio; and she has lived in Ohio, in the areas of Columbus and Cleveland, most of her life. She is one of Ohio's most distinguished citizens.

Clarence Emir Allen, her distinguished father, was a Representative from the State of Utah in the 54th Congress, from January 4, 1896, until March 3, 1897. Upon the admission of Utah as a State into the Union, he was the first Utah Representative elected to Congress. He was a graduate of Western Reserve College, in Ohio, a teacher and scholar in the classics, a lawyer, and active in mining pursuits in Utah.

Upon the occasion of her retirement as an active judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, on October 15, 1959, when her portrait was received by the court, Chief Judge Thomas F. McAllister said:

> The heart and mind of Florence Allen will flame for generations as a beacon for thousands of young women who will take their rightful places in government, in the practice of law, and in judicial service—and lawyers and judges yet unborn will read the words she has written, in the endless, ever-old, and ever-new quest for justice.

Judge Allen in her early years campaigned for the constitutional right of women to vote throughout the United States. Throughout her life, she has been a champion of women and a great leader of women; and she is venerated by them throughout the United States and in many countries of the world.

Endowed with great talents, she developed and employed them throughout her life in great causes. She is a great American.

In truth, she is a kind of renaissance woman, possessed of a great diversity of interests. She is possessed of an encyclopedic mind, humane sympathies, and noble, poetic, and musical sensitivity.

She is spared of the evil of thinking too much about thoughts and not enough about feelings and things.

Moreover she is not a captive of the rashness of present-day civilization. She is not motivated by rootless competition, speed, hurry, noise, and superficial pleasures. She believes in herself, in her beloved, in her home and country. These beliefs are for her the summit of good.

Woven into her knowledge of prosaic law is a spiritual quality rooted in poetry, music, and religion. Because of these spiritual qualities, she sees more widely, feels more deeply, and speaks more clearly and simply. She absorbs facts and figures as a blotter absorbs water.

The life of her achievements will remain with people far longer than her physical life. Her life will be looked to as an example for others to follow.

Mr. President, upon this occasion of the 81st anniversary of the birth of Florence Ellinwood Allen, I am pleased to join her many, many friends and admirers in extending warm congratulations and best wishes for her continued good health, happiness, and many blessings.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT QUOTAS MUST BE RETAINED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, earlier this month I appeared at hearings conducted by the Department of the Interior on all aspects of the mandatory oil import control program, at which time I urged that quotas be maintained on imports of foreign residual oil in order to avert damage to our Nation's coal industry and to the economy of my own State of West Virginia. Oil imports in 1964 were equivalent to some 70 million tons of bituminous coal. If this coal had been mined and sold, it would have increased mine and railroad employment, vital to the welfare of West Virginia, and would have provided an upward impetus to the general economy of the Appalachian region.

Following the hearings, Mr. Stephen F. Dunn, president, National Coal Association, wrote a guest editorial for the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser, stressing the need for protection of our Nation's coal industry through maintenance of controls on the importation of foreign residual oil.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the statement which I presented at the Interior Department hearings, together with the guest editorial by Mr. Dunn.

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

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Secretary, my very definite views on regulating and controlling the importation of foreign residual oil are well known to you. From the time of my election to Congress in 1952 to the present day, I have watched with concern the problems created in my State by the ever-increasing use, in this country, of a foreign waste product.

I shall not burden you or take your time with volumes of statistics. Your files are undoubtedly replete with these inasmuch as they have been presented before, and I have no doubt that they will be brought up to date by others who will testify today. However, approximately 4½ barrels of residual oil constitute the equivalent of 1 ton of coal, and the loss of each ton of coal

production has its impact upon my State and the people I represent. In 1953, my first year in Congress, residual oil imports amounted to 131,533 barrels. Our annual imports of foreign residual now constitute more than twice that amount, and the effect on the economy of West Virginia and Appalachia is direct and traumatic. These imports have their impact upon the jobs and upon the wages of coal miners and railroad workers. They affect the revenues of coal producers and the railroads; they are reflected in Federal, State, and local taxes.

The mining of coal is an extremely costly business. In the event of a national emergency, the coal industry will again be called upon to supply the fuel needs and other important power requirements. The continuing trend toward greater mechanization, together with the rising price level of mining machinery, has greatly increased the capital investment required for profitable coal mining operation. Additionally, retired railroad rolling stock is not easily or cheaply replaced. and unless the rail industry has the fiscal capacity and the financial stamina to handle greatly increased demands for coal in time of emergency, the Nation's security will be jeopardized. Moreover, an industry plagued by declining employment for a generation cannot raise a new generation of skilled and experienced coal miners in the time of an emergency to take the place of irreparable and irreplaceable equipment. Financial investments of the degree required cannot be made without the assurance of dependable future markets, and industries jeopardized by cheap waste products from abroad lack the desired assurance of that dependable future.

I think it also apropos to express the warning that we should guard against placing too much dependence on a foreign source of residual oil which may be denied to us as a result of hostile acts committed in shipping waters or at the source of foreign supply.

Finally, Mr. Secretary, the administration and the Congress have taken decisive and positive steps to assist in the rehabilitation of Appalachia. A dependable and healthy future for the coal industry is a necessity if we are to hope for an improved and more viable economy in the future of Appalachia. One way to underwrite a strong coal industry and an Appalachian economy that is in concert with the national economy would be to exercise appropriate and continuing controls over the imports of foreign residual oil. I do not maintain that residual imports ought to be entirely prohibited, as this would be unreasonable. I do submit, however, Mr. Secretary, that to remove or relax the quotas which now limit the imports of residual oil would compound the problems of Appalachia which the Appalachian Regional Development Act was designed, in some degree, to solve and would be a serious and costly mistake which the administration would long regret.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Mar. 22, 1965]

GOVERNMENT ACTION ON FUEL OIL CURB COULD SPARK MAJOR MINE DEVELOPMENTS

(Guest editorial by Stephen F. Dunn, president, National Coal Association)

The hand of the Federal Government is extended toward Appalachia and the coal industry, which is the Appalachian region's economic mainstay. We should know in a few days whether this is a helping hand—or a fist which will deliver still another damaging blow to a region and an industry already badly hurt by Government action.

If the Government wants to help coal, the Secretary of the Interior will continue mandatory controls on the importation of residual fuel oil. For this help to be effective, he should also give assurance that import quotas will stay at the present level for several years, instead of continuing their annual 9-percent increase.

As George Love, chairman of Consolidation Coal Co., told the Secretary March 11, Appalachian coal has a chance for a 65-million-ton annual market increase in east coast utilities by 1980. This would mean a capital investment of $650 to $780 million in new mines, $700 million in transportation equipment and facilities, and thousands of jobs for miners and railroad workers. But this will not happen as long as there is a prospect that residual oil import quotas may be increased at any time to eliminate coal from this market. Utilities will not sign long-term coal contracts, and lacking and assured market, coal companies and railroads cannot make the huge investments necessary for new mines and facilities.

Both West Virginia Senators ably testified for continuing controls over residual oil imports. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH said the welfare of domestic fuels industry, the people dependent upon them, and the security of the Nation, require "a meaningful, predictable program" of import controls. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD pointed out that a "dependable and healthy future" for the coal industry is necessary to improve the economy of Appalachia, and one way to assure this is to continue import controls on residual oil.

The hand of Government has dealt the coal industry other damaging blows. At a cost of some $2 billion, it has developed atomic power to competitive stature in coal's prime market—power generation. Nor is the Government yet content—the Atomic Energy Commission wants another $181 million in the next fiscal year to develop still more full-scale power reactors to take customers away from coal.

This proposal is particularly hard to justify because present types of atomic power-plants—and even the so-called advanced types which the AEC now proposes to subsidize—burn up our Nation's limited supplies of low-cost atomic fuel. And these supplies are indeed so limited that the Director of AEC's Division of Raw Materials has estimated the cumulative demands for uranium oxide will exhaust U.S. reserves between 1977 and 1980.

In contrast, America has enough coal for centuries. West Virginia alone could supply all the Nation's coal requirements at the 1964 production rate for more than 100 years. Some time in March, West Virginia produced her seven billionth ton of coal—but she has more than 50 billion tons of recoverable coal still buried under her hills.

True, our coal reserves, though enormous, are finite. Some time in the far future they will be exhausted, and then America will need her reserves of low-cost atomic fuel. But, meanwhile, the AEC hopes to develop so-called high-grain breeder reactors, which will make available more energy from atomic fuel than they consume. It should try to do so—in a deliberate, orderly manner. There is no need for a crash program. There is no need to squander taxpayers' funds, and our essential supplies of atomic fuel, on inefficient reactors.

Appalachia produces all the coal this country exports—almost 48 million tons in 1964. As David L. Francis, chairman of Princess Coals, Inc., of Huntington, pointed out in a recent letter to President Johnson, these foreign sales make a $500 million per year reduction in America's balance-of-payments deficit. We hope the Government will redouble its efforts to remove the barriers which foreign governments erect against our coal, for coal exports yield double benefits by helping the hard-hit Appalachian area and simultaneously bolstering the Nation's economic position.

The Government's program to aid Appalachia carries a price tag of $1.1 billion. But this elaborate program may be less helpful in the long run than some simple Government decisions which would cost the Government nothing.

In fact, Congress could save the taxpayers several million dollars by putting a check-rein on the Atomic Energy Commission's ambitions and getting AEC out of the business of creating unnecessary competition for coal.

Extending and stabilizing residual oil import controls would cost the taxpayers nothing but, as Mr. Love pointed out, it could bring an investment of $1.5 billion in private funds to Appalachia and create thousands of steady, high-paying jobs, and all it takes is the right decision by the Secretary of the Interior.

The coal industry and the Appalachian area are watching and waiting.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF OUR MERCHANT MARINE—SPEECH BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was honored yesterday, Wednesday, March 24, by the Washington chapter of the Propeller Club of the United States at a luncheon at the National Press Club, Washington.

In turn, Senator MAGNUSON honored the occasion by an important address on the significance of our merchant marine.

The authority, interest, and enthusiasm that the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee has in this area of our national concern is so well known that an expression of his thoughts was enough to summon a great audience patriotically dedicated to the promotion and support of the American merchant marine.

I feel that even a wider audience should have access to Senator MAGNUSON's remarks and I ask unanimous consent that this speech as an important document be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON BEFORE PROPELLER CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., CHAPTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Distinguished guests and members of the Washington Chapter of the Propeller Club, it is a pleasure for me to be with you to discuss the American merchant marine, and a particular pleasure to be introduced by my friend and colleague, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, and invited by your president, Earl Clark.

For me this week has had a special maritime significance. Not only have I an opportunity to address this distinguished maritime group, but this week I completed arrangements for awarding a contract to compile and codify the U.S. maritime laws. On Monday, I signed the contract with Pike & Fischer, Inc., a Washington firm highly respected in the maritime field. I need not stress with this audience the need for and significance of this action. For a number of years, the Propeller Club and other organizations and individuals interested in our merchant marine have attempted to have this effort undertaken. Now it is underway.

The contract will call for the preparation of a draft compilation and formal revision of the several Shipping and Merchant Marine Acts, principally those of 1916, 1920, 1928, 1933, 1936, and the Ship Sales Act of 1946. Both the contract and the informal discussion that have been held with the contractor

have made it absolutely clear that no substantive changes are to be made in the proposed draft. Some changes will, of course, be required because none of the basic Merchant Marine Acts have been rewritten since the reorganizational plans became law. But, I want to assure you that the Senate Commerce Committee will watch this with greatest care and will ask others to help.

Under the terms of the contract, the initial draft is to be completed this fall. The program then calls for a wide distribution of the proposed draft. Copies will be made available and full comments requested from the Maritime Administration, the Federal Maritime Commission, and other Government agencies. At the same time, private groups will be asked for their comments. As a part of the review program, the Senate Commerce Committee will appoint a special advisory group on the compilation of maritime law and I hope to appoint to this advisory group many of those who have worked with the Senate Commerce Committee in the past on other maritime law revision problems.

If all comments on the draft are promptly received, it may be possible to introduce a bill in the next session bringing together the U.S. merchant marine laws. This will take much work, but I am confident of your continued support.

My hope is that the compilation of the merchant marine acts will be timed to coordinate with the revision of the customs and coast guard laws. I have been advised that the U.S. Coast Guard has already undertaken the revision of its laws and that the Bureau of Customs has recently assigned additional staff to complete their work. Mindful of this need and the need for coordinated effort, I have written the new Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, and suggested close cooperation.

If the work progresses at the anticipated rate, we could have before Congress next session a new proposed maritime code with three parts: the first relating to the U.S. merchant marine, the second to the Bureau of the Customs, and the third to the Coast Guard. If all interests are fully informed each step of the way and if care is taken that no substantive changes are made, I believe that a new code can be passed into law that will conveniently bring together the many scattered statutes that pertain to the area of our mutual concern—the U.S. merchant marine.

I personally am very much encouraged by the progress made in this program. And I would like to share with you another development that I find encouraging. I am convinced that the United States for the first time in recent years is moving aggressively toward substantially improving our balance-of-payments position. As you know, the United States has continued to register a rather susbtantial deficit during the past 7 years. Last year, we had a deficit of $3 billion. I think that President Johnson and Secretary Connor should be congratulated for concentrating on this problem and for pursuing the voluntary program recently outlined. In stating what could be done, Secretary Connor strongly encouraged business to expand exports and to increase the use of American-flag vessels and airlines.

I would like first to make a few comments regarding the program of expanding U.S. exports. As you know, this is a subject in which I have a particular interest. Last year, U.S. exports exceeded $25 billion and we recorded a favorable balance of trade of $6.5 billion. Despite this, the $3 billion deficit in the balance of payments persisted so substantial improvements are still to be made.

Last week, the Senate Committee on Commerce held hearings for several days on a bill I proposed entitled the "Export Expansion Act of 1965." I will not comment on this legislation at great length, but, it has become quite clear from the record made even in the first few days of hearings on this bill that much can be done to encourage our exports and the development of new foreign markets. We have not pursued our commercial interests as aggressively as we might.

During hearings on the bill, the committee will review the adequacy of the present program of commercial attaches and of commercial-type trade fairs, and the need for a trade development corps. But, of all the inadequacies of our present export promotion program none, in my opinion, appears more formidable than the inadequacy in export financing. We all realize that this country has an abundance of capital which could be channeled into financing exports at a rate of interest comparable with the best terms that could be made available by any country in the world. The fact is that we are not doing this. The Export-Import Bank is the U.S. primary export financing facility. The Bank has followed a policy of extreme caution. In some instances, this may be justified, but it has had a serious impact on many of our national economic and commercial interests. It is, in my opinion, essential that the United States provide some means of extending export credit in those countries that are somewhere between the point of requiring constant economic aid and the point of full economic maturity. The U.S. AID program, of course, has been and is directed toward bringing developing countries out of their condition of economic stagnation into a period in which ordinary commercial transactions become feasible. We have, as you know, spent billions of dollars on this effort and we are today finding that many of the nations which we have helped are having to turn to Europe for commercial type loans shortly after our AID program is phased out. Certainly the hope was that the AID program would benefit the American economy in the long run by permitting American interests to gain the initial economic advantage in the developing countries. We believe that AID should lead to trade, but not having an export financing program competitive with Europe, we are today forcing many commercial interests in nations which have received aid to look to Europe and, in some instances, to the Communist bloc for softer commercial loans for needed imports. The importance of these developing foreign markets must be realized, and the new emphasis on export promotion as a means of improving our balance of payments is timely. With a more flexible form of export financing, the United States can find new markets and a substantial improvement in the balance of payments can be expected.

The other phase of the balance-of-payments program on which I would like to comment relates to encouraging the use of U.S.-flag vessels. I sincerely hope that the significance of this policy is understood, and understood clearly, for it is a new policy. In the past, the United States has only suggested in quiet ways that it might be helpful to use U.S.-flag carriers, but never has it been an official policy of the United States to actively and aggressively encourage this. The immediate question is how this policy can best be implemented.

Before offering some suggestions on how to implement this policy, I would like to place the problem in some perspective. The United States in 1964 had a balance-of-payments deficit of $3 billion and spent $1 billion for the services of foreign-flag vessels. During the same period, the United States was credited with $700 million in ocean freight transportation. American-flag vessels carried only 9 percent of the U.S. oceanborne foreign trade last year. In comparison, the United Kingdom carried 52 percent, France carried 59 percent, and Japan carried 46 percent. The relatively low percentage carried by American-flag vessels is related directly to the inadequacy of our present fleet, particularly the bulk carrier fleet, and the underutilization of important segments of the active fleet. I am advised that last year the United States subsidized lines operated on average in ocean shipments outbound from the United States with 85 percent capacity utilized to Europe, 75 percent utilization to South America, and 90 percent to the Far East. On inbound trades, the figures reflect a 55 percent capacity utilization on average from Europe, 50 percent from South America, and 60 percent from the Far East. Of course, individual companies in many instances varied widely from the average. Nevertheless, it is clear that a substantial improvement in utilization could be made on liner trade routes, notably inbound. This is significant because the U.S. importer often is in a position to make decisions on routing and liner cargo moves on conference rates. Therefore, the American importer would be relatively sure of space available by specifying American-flag carrier and would pay the same freight rate charged by foreign-flag liner operators. The potential appears promising.

I, therefore, hope Secretary of Commerce Connor will seriously consider calling in the near future a meeting of the Department's recently appointed Balance of Payments Advisory Committee to consider this particular aspect of the program. I am sure that if such a meeting were held, practical means could be developed with maritime industry and labor cooperation to implement effectively this constructive effort.

I would offer another suggestion. In asking for business cooperation certain information and reports were requested from over 600 businesses prominent in the U.S. foreign trade. I certainly hope that as a part of the reporting program an attempt will be made to obtain information as to what is being done or could be done by Government or the maritime industry itself to increase the use of U.S.-flag vessels. I think that the President's program is significant for our business community, for the U.S. merchant marine, and for the improvement of our balance of payments. It deserves our full support and certainly has mine.

As this use increases, I am sure that more of our shippers will find that it costs no more to use American-flag ships. In return, they will find a far more efficient operation.

One of America's largest shippers, and certainly its most important, is the Department of Defense. It could follow this advice to great advantage.

I've always thought the Department of Defense has not given the support to our merchant marine that it deserved. This includes testimony presented to Congress. It includes the assignment of cargo.

Actually, our merchant marine should figure as importantly in Defense Department planning as any other phase of logistics because in times of emergency our merchant marine is one of the first segments of private industry to receive the call and, fortunately until now, to heed it.

Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., recognized this fact when he recently said:

"We are presently involved in a total 'wet war' with the Soviet Union."

He added:

"There is intense competition in the fields of merchant shipping, oceanography, and the fishing industries, as well as between navies."

Admiral McCain warned:

"Perhaps the greatest challenge to our seapower supremacy is the Soviet merchant marine."

He noted that the United States has 900 flagships in the merchant marine while the Russians have 1,200. And they hope to double this by 1970.

I believe that there are many others in the Department of Defense, as Admiral McCain, who are basically conscious of this role which only our merchant marine can fill.

But we have our work cut out for us in hammering this message home to all officials in the Defense Department, just as we must take this message home to all Americans.

I can assure all those who work to improve our defense posture that we are facing a real serious problem unless we meet these merchant marine needs in the near future.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE VA CLOSINGS?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the April issue of the American Legion magazine contains a penetrating and thorough analysis of what is behind the effort to close out certain Veterans' Administration facilities and to consolidate others.

The article is written by American Legion National Commander Donald E. Johnson, and I call it to the attention of the Senate because I think it reveals information which all Members of the Senate—the entire Congress for that matter—should have before the final decision is reached as to whether or not these needed and vital facilities are terminated or reduced.

Mr. President, I am more than ever convinced that this present effort to close VA facilities represents not only a complete disservice to the American veterans but to the general taxpaying public as well for the claimed economies of such closures simply are nonexistent.

That and other important points are made abundantly clear in Commander Johnson's report, and I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT'S BEHIND THE VA CLOSINGS?

(By National Commander Donald E. Johnson)

At this writing the assault on adequate veterans' medical and counseling services launched by the Veterans' Administration directive of January 13 has been slowed. The Congress has barred until May 1 any steps to close the 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliary homes, and 16 regional offices.

This does not mean we have won the battle. It means we have time to fight it.

The crucial test comes now. Advocates of the cutback are betting that the initial congressional and public resistance will subside, clearing the way for the closings. We must sustain in coming weeks the barrage of protests, backed by facts and logic, which has been leveled at Washington. If you have already written to your Congressman and Senators, write again. Write to President Johnson at the White House. Ask him if it is a purpose of the Great Society to impose additional hardship and heartache upon sick and helpless veterans.

Developments since the cutback announcement, reported in further detail on page 31 of this magazine, have served to confirm our first grim estimate of the situation.

The real target of the January 13 order is not the facilities marked for closing. It is the special status and recognition historically accorded America's veterans—the bottom stone of the entire veterans' benefit program.

The current attack, masterminded by the Bureau of the Budget, is designed to carry out by executive department edict those recommendations of the Hoover and Bradley Commissions which the Congress rejected. Their aim: to remove the Veterans' Administration as the Federal agency serving veterans and to parcel out its responsibilities to other agencies under a social welfare scheme.

If this slash in service goes through, others will follow. VA services will be diminished for veterans and opened to increasing numbers of nonveterans.

The VA at first claimed that the closings would save millions of dollars and that the facilities were selected because they were obsolete, hard to staff, or had low patient demand. Both claims turned out to be total misrepresentations.

In meetings with American Legion representatives and in testimony before Congress, Administration spokesmen admitted that the alleged economies could not be documented. They acknowledged that the cutback, involving wholesale transfers of patients and personnel and equipment, would raise—not lower—operating costs. They conceded that any saving from a reduction of VA services would be offset by the cost of adding equivalent services in other agencies.

Why was the economy argument tried? Apparently, strategists hoped it would add another star to the administration's thrift crown and would give Members of Congress a politically potent answer for any criticism back home. Fortunately, the people and the Congress weren't fooled.

The VA's stated reasons for selecting the facilities proved to be equally indefensible. In January the 271-bed hospital at McKinney, Tex., had 279 patients and 74 veterans on the waiting list. Congressman RAY ROBERTS of Texas stated, without contradiction, that the hospital "has at least 7 to 10 more years of life without any major repairs."

Confronted with facts refuting their case against one facility after another, VA officials explained that errors had been made. The Wall Street Journal of February 18 attributed this to VA's "anxiety to forestall criticism." The record indicates that the agency, under a Budget Bureau ultimatum, was trying to justify actions that couldn't be justified on their merits.

With the original case for the cutback discredited, the Administration is taking a new tack. The closings should be effected, we are now told, because they will result in improved service to veterans. Somebody close to the White House must be convinced that the American people will believe anything.

In late January, while a freeze on new patient admissions to the 11 hospitals was in force, a veteran residing 15 minutes away from upstate New York's Castle Point Hospital was stricken by meningitis. Turned away at Castle Point, he had to be ambulanced 2½ hours through ice and snow to the hospital at Albany. Is this the "improved service" they promise?

Phillip S. Hughes, an Assistant Director of the Budget Bureau, told the House Veterans' Affairs Committee that the cutback would be "disruptive to those affected." Mr. Hughes speaks from the computer-insulated shelter of a Federal bureaucracy where dollar signs and digits take precedence over human needs and the Government's good faith. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, spoke for a larger group of Americans when he observed: "In dealing with the sick or disabled veterans we are not dealing with commodities; we are dealing with human beings. They cannot be treated as mere numbers on a punch card."

Will shutting down 16 regional offices improve VA services? On the contrary, it can only mean second-class service for all veterans living outside metropolitan areas.

Closing the offices in Vermont and New Hampshire, for example, would compel veterans in those States to go to Boston for counseling or claims help. With rail and bus service virtually nonexistent, they would have to make the trip by car and then wait their turn in an office coping with a greatly expanded workload. Obtaining the help, now quickly available at regional offices in their respective States, might well cost them 3 or 4 days with attendant expenses. How many veterans or their widows or dependents with claims can afford that kind of investment? Most of them are in need, and many of them are too sick or disabled for such trips.

The VA says hospitals to be built later will make up for the beds lost in the cutback. But what about the veterans who will need hospitalization in the meantime? And what assurance do we have that the VA can keep its word?

The fact is that while the VA proposes, the Budget Bureau disposes. Twenty months ago the VA inaugurated a nursing bed program which it said would provide 4,000 beds for veterans. Today, the program has 46 beds. The Budget Bureau sat on the funds needed to activate it.

The January 13 order, it is clear now, has nothing to do with economy of efficiency or improved service to veterans. It appears, rather, to be one step in a long-range administration plan to merge and subordinate the VA system in an all-purpose Federal health and welfare colossus.

President Johnson in his 1965 budget message to the Congress said, "As we continue to improve our social security and health protection programs, we should place greater reliance on these programs for meeting veterans' needs not connected with their military service." A Budget Bureau official testified that there will be "interrelation" between VA care and medicare, and that medicare "will certainly decrease the demands upon VA facilities." Under a "cross-servicing" procedure hatched in the Budget Bureau, VA hospitals shortly will accept seamen and other Merchant Marine beneficiaries formerly treated in Public Health Service facilities.

The intent is plain. It contemplates the day when there will no longer be a single Federal agency charged with looking after legally certified veterans' needs: when nonservice-connected veterans will be identified only as numbers on national welfare rolls; when admissions to veterans' hospitals will be processed without regard to wartime service in the Armed Forces.

This is the ultimate dimension of the challenge we face. We must fight it one battle at a time, and the present battle is over the pending VA cutback. Join it. Help win it by mailing your protests and appeals to the White House and the Congress.

WHAT IS A FARMER?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the American farmer works in wind and weather producing an abundance that makes the people of this Nation the best fed in history, and he does it in relative silence in a time of noisy sound from the commercial world about other problems in other segments of the economy.

We often hear about the productive genius of our farmers. All too seldom, however, do we hear from the farmer's wife, the indispensable partner in American agriculture.

Mrs. Doris T. West, of Thomas & West Farms, Meadville, Mo., has written a tribute, in one of the best word pictures I have read, of the many roles a farmer must fill. Mrs. West helps her husband operate a 900-acre beef-hog farm in Linn County, Mo.

I ask unanimous consent that her article entitled "What Is a Farmer?" as published in the Farm Journal of February 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHAT IS A FARMER?

(By Doris T. West)

Farmers are found in fields—plowing up, seeding down, rotating from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for, and harvesting if. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agriculture Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them, meals wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

When your car stalls along the way, a farmer is a considerate, courteous, inexpensive road service. When a farmer's wife suggests he buy a new suit, he can quote from memory every expense involved in operating the farm last year plus the added expenses he is certain will crop up this year. Or else he assumes the role of the indignant shopper, impressing upon everyone within earshot the pounds of pork he must produce in order to pay for a suit at today's prices.

A farmer is a paradox—he is an overalled executive with his home his office; a scientist using fertilizer attachments; a purchasing agent in an old straw hat; a personnel director with grease under his fingernails; a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, aminos and antibiotics; a production expert faced with a surplus, and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze. He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

He likes sunshine, good food, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, Saturday nights in town, his shirt collar unbuttoned and, above all, a good soaking rain in August.

He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, helping with housework, or grasshoppers.

Nobody else is so far from the [redacted] or so close to God. Nobody else gets so much satisfaction out of modern plumbing, good weather and homemade ice cream. Nobody else has in his pockets at one time a three-bladed knife, checkbook, a billfold, a pair of pliers and a combination memo book and general farm guide.

Nobody else can remove these things from his pockets and, on washday, have overlooked: five "steeples," one cotter key, a rusty spike, 3 grains of corn, the stub end of a lead pencil, a square tap, a $4.98 pocket watch, and a cupful of chaff in each trouser cuff.

A farmer is both faith and fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God (a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought) can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

Might as well put up with him—he is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food, fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise, fast-growing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: "The market's up."

PENNSYLVANIA STATE SENATE URGES VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the right to vote is a fundamental right guaranteed every American by the Constitution. It is a right which the 15th amendment, adopted 95 years ago, very clearly states "shall not be denied or abridged" because of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." But it is a right which is still denied many Americans because of the color of their skin. That is why a group of us here in the Senate have been working since February on new voter registration legislation, and have introduced a bill which would insure the right of every American to vote.

But the grim drama which has been unfolding in Selma, Ala., in recent weeks has brought tragic new emphasis to this failure to comply with a fundamental law of our land. The death of 26-year-old Jimmie Lee Jackson, by wounds inflicted by the Alabama State police, aroused decent citizens in all parts of the Nation.

The murder in Selma of a respected clergyman, and the vivid picture of a racist sheriff's armed possemen beating and flogging Americans whose only crime was a desire to vote, focused the attention of all Americans on the fact that many of their fellow citizens in Alabama and elsewhere are still barred from voting because of their color.

The Senate of Pennsylvania has passed a resolution urging the U.S. Congress to pass such legislation. I ask unanimous consent to insert into the body of the RECORD this timely resolution.

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

The success of any democracy depends upon the right of the citizenry to express itself at the polls. Whenever this right is denied to any citizen or group of citizens, democracy itself is in jeopardy.

It has been obvious for some time that there are many places in our country where citizens are denied the right to vote because of their race or color. This has been accomplished by making it almost impossible for such people to register to vote.

The events of the past several weeks in Selma, Ala., have reminded us of this blot on our form of government.

Because the registration officials in Selma, Ala., continued this form of denial, peaceful demonstrations of protest have been conducted. The police and others have responded to the demonstrations with violence. Many demonstrators have been injured, some seriously.

Many members of the clergy, of all faiths, throughout the land, went to Selma to join the demonstrators and add the weight of their religious and moral convictions to the issue. One of the clergy who went to Selma was the Reverend James J. Reeb, a 38-year-old Unitarian-Universalist from Boston, Mass. While in Selma, Reverend Reeb was attacked and badly beaten. As a result of this beating, Reverend Reeb died. He left behind a wife and four children.

The President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, is about to address a joint session of the Congress of the United States to discuss proposals he is about to submit to the Congress insuring the right to register and vote for all citizens of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby expresses its profound sadness on the untimely death of the Reverend James J. Reeb and extends to his family its condolences; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt into law the proposals insuring citizens of the right to register 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 in the Congress of the United States.

Attest:

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

SENATOR SCOTT LAUDS ROLE OF EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, all of our churches and people of all faiths have been working, and working hard, for progress in civil rights, but, as a member of the Anglican communion, I am particularly proud of the active role of my Episcopal Church over the years in the civil rights movement.

In Selma, Ala., when State police and the armed possemen of a segregationist sheriff were turned loose on American citizens peacefully demonstrating for the right to vote, more than 110 representatives of the Episcopal Church went to Alabama and joined in the protest.

Twelve Episcopal bishops and hundreds of clergy joined in the now historic march on Washington in 1963.

My heart swelled with pride when I recently read in a Washington paper that Washington's Episcopal suffragan bishop, Paul H. Moore, Jr., was the first to answer pleas for contributions to finance a kitchen for voting rights demonstrators at Washington's Lafayette Square. He immediately wrote a check for $100 with an agreement that any left-over funds would be sent to families of persons injured in Selma. Bishop Moore, and countless members of the Episcopal clergy, were in the forefront of that demonstration of sympathy for the brutalized and disenfranchised Negro voters of Alabama.

This involvement of the Episcopal Church and its clergy in the civil rights movement is no new thing. As far back as 1943 a biracial committee was formed. One of this committee's guiding principles was: "Desegregation must be the goal for all church institutions and agencies."

In a resolution adopted by the 59th General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1958, the Episcopal church resolved to "work together toward the establishment, without racial discrimination, of full opportunities in fields such as education, housing, employment, and public accommodations."

All across America, in pulpits, in pews, and on picket lines, leaders and members of the Episcopal Church have been and are directly involved in this great struggle for human liberty. They know that, though progress has been made, though the Macedonian cry of the churches echoes and reechoes, the road ahead is still a long one. They are concerned, in the words of the Right Reverend Robert L. DeWitt, bishop of Pennsylvania, with the constant slowness of that progress. And they feel that we must, as Bishop DeWitt has so eloquently stated, "do whatever we can to move, whatever we can to learn, to help ourselves to change, to help men and institutions—including the churches—to wake up and move."

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the proposed Federal budget for fiscal 1966 as it relates to the agricultural conservation program and, more particularly, to the Soil Conservation Service, has become a matter of deep concern to the farmers and conservationists of Missouri. The budget for fiscal 1966 recommends a 20-percent cut in appropriations for soil conservation technical assistance and a 40-percent reduction in appropriations for cost-sharing aid. To replace the reductions in funds for these programs, there is proposed legislation to establish a public enterprise revolving fund to finance the cost of technical services provided to soil and water conservation districts and cooperating farmers. Institution of the fund would require cooperating districts or landowners to pay to the Soil Conservation Service a user's charge of up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance, with collections of $20 million estimated for 1966.

I believe that these reductions in appropriations for our conservation programs, and the institution of the revolving fund to take their place, would seriously impede national efforts to stimulate and effect conservation of our vital soil and water resources and would undermine the progress that has been made toward this goal in the last 30 years. The effect of such changes in the soil and water conservation program would be especially unfortunate in Missouri because the agricultural conservation program and the development of soil conservation districts has been slow in acceptance until recent years. At the present time we have 65 soil and water conservation districts established in Missouri out of a total of 114 counties in the State. But interest has broadened in recent years and we have been progressing rapidly: seven districts organized in fiscal 1963, six districts organized in fiscal 1964, and four in fiscal 1965. This progress is traceable to the devotion and efforts of many people in Missouri who realize the value of the soil and water conservation program to our State. But the progress could not have been accomplished without the full participation of the Federal Government in providing aid and technical assistance on a local basis. In Missouri, much remains to be done, and perhaps more than in any other State in the Union the cause of development and scientific management of our soil and water resources depends on continued and expanded Federal participation and assistance. Reductions in appropriations or the substitution of the so-called revolving fund device would cripple the program in Missouri. I have heard from very nearly all of the soil and water conservation districts in Missouri and their letters all indicate they share the view and the alarm I have expressed. I would like one letter, which I believe illustrates the concern felt by the people of my State particularly well, to be printed at this point in the RECORD. The letter is from the chairman and the members of the board of supervisors of the Scotland Soil and Water Conservation District.

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

HON. EDWARD V. LONG,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: We need your help. The Federal Budget Bureau has proposed legislation that, if enacted, will kill the Scotland Soil District program.

The proposed budget for assistance to soil districts for fiscal year 1966 (July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966) is $104,103,000. This is $130,000 less than the last fiscal year, but the Budget Bureau has recommended to Congress that soil district cooperators be forced to pay $20 million of the proposed budget for fiscal year 1966.

This would be done by the soil districts charging district cooperators for services from the Soil Conservation Service. Money collected by the soil districts from cooperators would be returned to the Federal Government to be used as a revolving fund.

Under the proposed legislation, there would be no charge for services on watersheds, farm planning, soil surveys, flood prevention, Greal Plains conservation programs, and resource conservation and development projects. This would mean that all the $20 million would have to be paid by cooperators using the Soil Conservation Service for layout and installation of conservation practices on their individual farms.

This would average out about $7,000 to each soil district, and would probably mean $14,000 to an active district like ours. We feel like the soil district could not operate under these conditions if the proposed Federal legislation is enacted.

We had an active program in 1964, but no one was knocking our door down demanding assistance in applying conservation practices. It still takes hard selling and a good educational program to get the work done. Landowners do not fully realize the value of conservation practices until they are applied to the land.

It is impossible to measure the value of soil and water conservation in dollars. What is the value of an acre of land that will produce food and fiber forever?

The Scotland soil district is probably the best financed district in Missouri. If you will refer to our financial statement for 1964, you can see that our donations from district cooperators was $475.50. This, plus some other district income, was about sufficient to carry out the district educational program.

It is our opinion that 99 percent of our district cooperators would be unable or unwilling to pay for technical service for layout of conservation practices.

Scotland County has good land and good farmers. We would say it was about the average county for the Corn Belt. Our young farmers are World War II veterans. About 10 percent of our farmers are drawing social security, about 70 percent are over 50 years old. We have less than 5 percent of our farmers under 30 years of age. Over 80 percent of Scotland County farmers have net incomes of less than $3,000.

Most farmers over 60 years old have semiretired or retired on the farm. They produce very little, but are happy where they are. As these people die, the land is normally absorbed into larger units that must produce.

A lot of people are worried about having too many farmers. We are worried about having enough farmers in the future. Absorbing small units into larger ones is not the complete answer. The present average farm wage in Scotland County is $150 per month.

In Indian language, the administration has been speaking with a forked tongue. We've heard talk of the poverty program, beautifying the countryside, help for small farmers, economic stability, the importance of conservation work in Johnson County, Tex., self-help programs, local leadership and self-government, and the Federal Government's responsibility to its people. Yet, the administration has proposed legislation that will kill the soil district program, which has been doing all of these things the last 30 years.

Yours truly,

FLOYD DUNN,
Chairman.
RAYMOND AUSTIN,
Vice Chairman.
E. R. WEBBER,
Treasurer.
EUGENE NEWLAND,
Member.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the importance of the Soil Conservation Service to the people of Missouri is evidenced by the resolution adopted by the Missouri State House of Representatives, House Resolution 113, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD:

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

HOUSE RESOLUTION 113

Whereas the house of representatives of the 73d general assembly, resolves that the Missouri General Assembly strongly protest to the Congress of the United States, the proposed cut in funds for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; and

Whereas the present agricultural budget for soil and water conservation has remained the same for several years while costs have been increased; and

Whereas good progress has been made in Missouri in the past 30 years, but much work is yet to be done; and

Whereas 11 million acres of cropland is subject to erosion and 4 million acres of flatland have a drainage problem; and

Whereas Missouri has 18 million acres of cropland making it one of the outstanding agricultural States in the country; and

Whereas soil and water are without a doubt the most important resources in Missouri affecting both family farms, rural communities, and urban areas; and

Whereas the reduction of funds by $20 million as recommended to be paid by landowners for technical assistance in applying practices would retard and delay the progress of soil and water conservation which is, as stated, national concern, affecting the welfare of all citizens of our State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress be encouraged to restore the proposed $20 million cut in appropriations for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in order that Missouri may continue to provide technical assistance to landowners in installing planned conservation on their lands; and be it further

Resolved, That we also urge a continuation and expansion of this effective program which we believe is essential for maintenance of the family farm, the economic stability of the rural community, and the preservation of our water resources, food supply, and recreational opportunities for both rural and urban communities; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, President of the Senate, and to each member of the Missouri delegation in the Congress of the United States.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CONFERENCE BETWEEN GENERALS LEE AND GRANT AT APPOMATTOX, VA.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to extend to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to the general public, a most cordial invitation to attend exercises, in the national interest, at Appomattox, Va., April 9, 1965.

On that date we shall observe the 100th anniversary of one of the most important dates in our history.

It is the anniversary of the day on which Gen. Robert E. Lee and Gen. Ulysses S. Grant met at the conference table in Appomattox and negotiated peace terms between the North and the South.

I know of no event of more importance to the Nation since our Constitution was adopted. It represented the uniting of a war-torn nation, the healing of a breach, the welding together of a great people, the rebirth of a nation.

There will be conducted at the Appomattox Court House National Historical Park commemorative services honoring these two great men, Generals Lee and Grant, as well as the peace that was achieved that day 100 years ago.

Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, a grandson of General Grant, and Robert E. Lee IV, a great grandson of General Lee, will take part in the ceremony dedicating the restoration of the old courthouse where the Confederate soldiers were mustered out after the peace terms had been agreed upon.

Mr. Bruce Catton, the author of "A Stillness at Appomattox," a noted scholar and Pulitzer Prize winner as well as a great historian, will deliver the address.

The Marine Band from Quantico will provide the music. The Governor of Virginia and many other notables will be present.

A great monument stands there now as an emblem of peace among our people, and in memory of those fine men who fought and died for the principles they believed in.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, March 25 marks the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian independence, for it was on March 25, 1918, that the proud freedom-loving Byelorussian people proclaimed their sovereignty and established the Byelorussian Democratic Republic with its capital in the historic city of Minsk.

This freedom, alas, was enjoyed but a short time for despite all of the sacrifices made by her people the young Byelorussian state was unable to preserve her independence against the onslaught of Russian Communist forces which overran the tiny country early in 1921.

Since that brutal takeover by the Communist Russians some 10 million Byelorussians have been forced to live under the oppressive Soviet totalitarian regime. As those of us in the free world know full well, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, which was created in place of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, is nothing but an administrative arm of the Moscow government, and does not represent the will of the Byelorussian people.

In spite of their being forced to live under the burdensome yoke of Soviet totalitarianism, the Byelorussian people have not abandoned their goal of national freedom and independence. This is why March 25 is being celebrated by Byelorussians throughout the free world as a symbol of their national aspirations.

We here in the United States assure the Byelorussians of our continued interest and concern, and express our fervent hope that the valiant efforts of these people will be rewarded, and that Byelorussia will once again be free.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today marks the 47th anniversary of the Byelorussian Independence Day—an anniversary of great importance for American citizens of Byelorussian descent. They are a loyal group who have been doing everything they can to protest Soviet oppression, and to regain the independence and freedom of Byelorussia.

An eloquent plea was made last week by the distinguished Most Reverend Archbishop Vasili, of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church, when he delivered the opening prayer in the Senate. Because the flame of freedom burns brightly in the hearts of these captive people, in spite of harsh restrictions, deportations, imprisonment, and other repressive measures, and because their hope for independence is still strong, it is extremely important that the United States keep alive this hope of freedom. My respect for the self-determination of the Byelorussian people is well known, and I take this opportunity to reaffirm my support of efforts on their behalf and on behalf of the freedom of all the peoples of the captive nations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at the convention of the Americans of Byelorussian descent, held on March 21, 1965, at the Hotel Biltmore, in New York City, for the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

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

The Byelorussians of the free world have been closely following the events in the country of their origin. By virtue of their unflagging efforts to keep in touch with their former compatriots, there emerges a picture of Byelorussians oppressed by communism but forever trying to improve their present status and to change their future for the better. Undoubtedly, they have succeeded in pushing back the darkness somewhat. Nonetheless, their aspirations to a Byelorussian statehood have so far been blocked by the incubus of a foreign ideology, placed on their country by violence.

The idea of democratic freedom and independence, which the Byelorussians have consecrated with lives, is indestructible among them. This idea was given impetus by the anti-Russian uprising of 1863; it was developed and enriched by a host of writers of the national rebirth movement, and in the years of the Byelorussian national revolution of 1917 to 1918 it reached fruition. The convention believes that national independence for Byelorussia will be realized, for the independence movement constitutes an organic part of the historical process in this century.

Democratic sovereignty, the theme of this period, was expressed by the Byelorussians through their national leader, the poet Janka Kupala (1882–1942), who wrote: "Each people should be its own master."

Sooner or later, the Byelorussian nation shall become its own master. This is its most sacred dream and yearning. The achievement of this goal is in the interest not only of Byelorussia but of the whole community of nations.

In the world of today, cowering from the specter of nuclear war, international understanding is more urgently needed than ever. The existence of the United Nations underlies this need.

Coexistence and cooperation among nations, however, will rest upon firm foundations only when each nation will speak for itself; when neighboring states or nationalities will not usurp another nation's name and economic resources, as in the case of Byelorussia, whose name is being used by Russia in its international manifestations and blackmailing.

The endeavors of Byelorussians to have the right to speak for themselves and to be their own masters constitute the essence of recent developments in Byelorussia. They become especially obvious among the younger generation of the Byelorussian intelligentsia: among writers, artists, teachers and students. Through their voices and creative talents, the Byelorussian people are striving to rehabilitate their past, of which it was totally deprived during the years of Stalinist terror, and to promote a maximum of political and economic freedom. Taken all together, these aspirations form the core of the idea of independence and democracy as it was promulgated in the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

We, the participants of this convention for the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian independence, therefore solemnly resolve—

In the all-out, further struggle for free Byelorussia,

To spotlight the cultural, economic, and political achievements of the Byelorussian people; and

To unmask before the world the political, economic, and moral enslavement of Byelorussia by Soviet Russian imperialism.

May the torch of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic of March 1918 never go out.

Long live the free democratic Byelorussia.

STANISLAU STANKEVICH, Ph. D.,
National President of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

ULADZIMIER NABAGIEZ, M.D.,
President of the New York Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

SIARHIEJ HUTYRCHYK,
President of the New Jersey Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, March 25, 1965, is the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian National Independence Day, a day of great importance to American citizens of Byelorussian descent, as well as for all Byelorussians living in the countries of the free world, and in Byelorussia itself, occupied and oppressed by Soviet Russia today. It is the day on which Byelorussians celebrate the happy period in which their country enjoyed independence.

On March 25, 1918, the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic pro-

claimed the independence of the Byelorussian state, but their freedom soon became a prize they had to win on the battlefield. Armed forces of Germany, Russia, and Poland, engulfed the Byelorussian Army from the east and from the west, finally conquering Byelorussia and dividing her territory among themselves.

During the Second World War on June 27, 1944, the Second Byelorussian Congress convened in Minsk. The Congress annulled all treaties of the occupational governments concerning Byelorussia and approved the proclamation of independence for the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. However, Russian power once again crushed the Republic and, in an attempt to crush also the spirit of the Byelorussian people, the conquering Soviet Union ignored natural ethnographical order and redistributed the people.

During this 47-year history of persecution and oppression, the anniversary of the 1918 proclamation of independence has been honored in the free countries of the world. Against the mass terror the Russians have used to destroy more than 5 million of their population, against the increased intensity of Russification and antireligious campaigns in the press, the Byelorussian people have shown valiant courage and determination. They have earned the respect and admiration of all peoples and have become an exceptional symbol of resistance to Communism. It is proper that we should join them on this day in the rededication of their goals toward a free and independent Byelorussian Republic.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENOCIDE CONVENTIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on March 11 it was my privilege to address a conference convened in Washington by the ad hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Conventions, a citizens' organization representing virtually every sector of the American community and embracing organizations that can claim to speak for some 100 million Americans.

The Genocide Convention has been languishing in the Foreign Relations Committee now for almost 16 years. Three other U.N. conventions dealing with the abolition of all forms of slavery, the abolition of forced labor, and the political rights of women, have been there almost as long.

I believe that our failure to ratify these conventions projects a most unfortunate image of the United States to the rest of the world. I also believe that much of the opposition to the ratification of these conventions is based upon misunderstanding and misconceptions.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the text of my statement before the conference of the ad hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Conventions. I hope that my statement will help to throw some additional light on these sadly misunderstood measures. And, I hope too that support can be found to bring them to a vote before this session concludes.

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

THE NEED TO RATIFY THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION AND OTHER U.N. CONVENTIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

(Remarks of Senator THOMAS J. DODD before the conference of the ad hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Conventions, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Thursday, Mar. 11, 1965.)

Mr. Bingham, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, I have accepted your invitation to address this conference out of a sense of duty because I believe there is no more important item of unfinished business on the calendar of the Senate than the ratification of the Genocide Convention.

It is now 17 long years since the Genocide Convention, with strong American backing, was approved by the U.N. General Assembly. And it is 15 years—almost 16 years—since it went to the Senate for ratification in June 1949.

The convention has been ratified by 67 nations to date, including all the members of the Communist bloc in the U.N. But for some strange reason, the great United States of America, which has done more to extend the frontiers of freedom than any other nation, has not ratified the convention.

In June of 1949, President Truman submitted the Genocide Convention to the Senate with his own enthusiastic endorsement.

In January of 1950, a special Genocide Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, under the chairmanship of a great Connecticut Senator, Brien McMahon, conducted public hearings. It was my privilege to testify in favor of ratifying the convention before this committee. I say it was my privilege not only because of the great importance I attach to the convention but because of the exceptionally distinguished body of citizens, representing more than 50 national organizations, who took the witness stand with me to urge ratification.

In its report to the full Foreign Relations Committee, the McMahon subcommittee strongly recommended ratification of the convention. But despite extensive hearings, despite the declared approval of all the major religious, ethnic, civic, and veterans organizations, the covenant still languishes in the Foreign Relations Committee without affirmative action.

Fifteen years, sixteen years, is a long time to wait for the ratification of any treaty or convention. The long lapse of time, has, I am afraid, blurred our memories and obscured the issues and dulled our conscience. There have been times in our history when the Government has needed prodding, and other times when Congress has needed prodding or intervention from citizens and citizens' organizations. I believe that this national conference, representing as it does every sector of the American community and embracing organizations which can claim to speak for 100 million Americans, constitutes a citizens' intervention in the highest American tradition.

Those of you who have initiated this conference and those of you who have come here to participate in its deliberation will, in my opinion, merit the thanks of coming generations of Americans. This conference, from what I have already seen of it, will unquestionably serve to bring the issue of genocide to life again. And you will, I hope, be able to clear away the intellectual cobwebs that have obscured the issue and encourage the Senate to take the long overdue action of ratification.

What is the Genocide Convention about? In my opinion, there could be no simpler or more fundamental moral issue written into a covenant between the nations of the world.

Essentially, the convention establishes that genocide is a crime under international law; and it defines genocide as the destruction of a racial ethnic or religious or national group, or part of that group, committed with the specific intent to destroy this group, in whole or in part. It includes the actual killing of members of the group, or causing them serious bodily or mental harm, or deliberately inflicting conditions of life on them calculated to bring about their physical destruction, or forcefully transferring children of the group to another group. It states that these acts are punishable, as well as conspiracy to commit genocide, to direct or publicly incite to commit genocide, or complicity in genocide.

Under article 5 of the Genocide Convention, the contracting parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, legislation which would give effect to the provisions of the convention and which would establish penalties for persons guilty of acts of genocide.

It seems to me that nothing could be clearer than this.

For me the Genocide Convention has a special personal meaning because as executive trial counsel at Nuremberg I had spread before me, in nightmarish detail, the whole incredible story of Nazi barbarism, of its fiendish persecution of the Jewish people, and of the gas chamber and crematoria that snuffed out the lives of more than 5 million Jews and of millions of Ukrainians, Poles, and other Europeans.

The convicted Nazis were charged with crimes against humanity. The word "genocide" had not yet come into common usage at that time. But to a very large degree this is what the Nuremberg trial was about. For the first time there was spread on the record of an international tribunal the details of massive crimes involving millions of victims—crimes perpetrated not against individuals but against entire peoples and ethnic groups.

While I was at Nuremberg I learned about other acts of genocide that were not made part of the trial record.

I learned of the mass deportations of the Volga Germans and the Kalmuks and the Chechens and other Soviet minority people during the war years.

I learned the true facts about the massacre in the Katyn Forest of 10,000 Polish officers who had been prisoners of the Soviets.

I learned of the mass deportations of scores of thousands of intellectuals and community leaders from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the period following the Soviet occupation.

I learned, in short, that Communist totalitarianism, like Nazi totalitarianism, uses genocide as an instrument of policy, and that the death of nazism did not necessarily mean that we had put an end to the problem of genocide.

Although 67 nations have ratified the Genocide Convention, it has, by and large, remained ineffective, inoperative, and without the necessary authority because the United States has thus far refused to add its ratification.

The years that have elapsed have witnessed situations where genocide has unquestionably been perpetrated and other situations where there was strong prima facie evidence of genocide.

In the case of Hungary the massacre of 25,000 Hungarian freedom fighters by the Red army and the subsequent mass execution and imprisonment of scores of thousands of Hungarian intellectuals, brought the charge from many quarters that the Soviets were guilty of genocide.

One year later the Chinese Communists crushed the Tibetan revolution with such ruthless measures that the International Commission of Jurists, in its report on the

question of Tibet, made the unequivocal statement that Red China had been guilty of the crime of genocide.

In recent years we have witnessed in the Soviet Union a systematic campaign against the Jewish minority and the Jewish religion. While there have been no mass killings of Jews, it is clear that the objective of this campaign is the early and total obliteration of the Jewish religion and of Yiddish culture. Is this genocide within the meaning of convention? This is a matter that might have to be decided by some properly constituted authority. But certainly the allegation of genocide in this case merits the most careful consideration.

In each of these instances the conscience of America has been shocked. We have cried out in protest. Our leaders and our spokesmen have decried the mass killings, and in some cases, they have even used the term "genocide" in referring to the crimes perpetrated by the Communists in these countries.

But the impact of our protest is weakened and our ability to intervene effectively remains seriously restricted so long as we ourselves have not ratified the Genocide Convention, which makes such acts an international crime.

What is more, I feel that our entire moral position, and our claim to leadership in the fight for freedom and justice and human decency, is prejudiced by our failure to ratify the Genocide Convention and the three other United Nations conventions dealing respectively with the abolition of all forms of slavery, the abolition of forced labor, and the political rights of women.

What an irony it is that this Nation, which abolished slavery almost 100 years ago, which does not practice genocide at any level of government, which long ago put an end to forced and indentured labor, and whose women enjoy the broadest political rights, should abstain from ratifying these four basic United Nations documents dealing with the rights of man, while the Communist nations, which are guilty on every score, have ratified all of these conventions or most of them.

What a false image of the United States our persistent failure to ratify these conventions projects to the world.

Needless to say, the Communists are clever enough to make use of our failure for the purpose of challenging our commitment to freedom and blackening our reputation. Among the newly emerging nations of the world, regrettably, the most widely believed facts about the United States are frequently those purveyed by radio Moscow or Peiping.

For example, in January of 1964, there was a debate in the UN subcommission on the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities. The Soviet member strongly opposed the establishment of international machinery for reporting upon and encouraging the elimination of racial and ethnic discrimination. At every point he was on the defensive. Finally, he decided to go over to the offensive.

The Soviet spokesman suggested that it was rather hypocritical of the American delegate to charge the Soviet Union with resisting the establishment of implementation machinery when "the United States had not ratified the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide or the Convention on Slavery."

The American delegate had to reply in embarrassment that he could only "regret of course that my country has not ratified the Convention on Genocide."

I am certain that as this exchange was reported over radio Moscow and radio Peiping, primitive peoples around the world were led to believe that the United States was opposed to ratification because it practices slavery and practices genocide.

It is time—high time—that we put an end to this invidious situation.

In the words of our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, "The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility for support of the very fundamentals which distinguish our concept of government from all forms of tyranny."

There is only one way out of this dilemma. The Senate of the United States must at the earliest opportunity act to ratify the Genocide Convention and the Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of Women.

I know that some Senators have expressed the opinion that these measures will fail of ratification because we cannot get two-thirds of the Members of the Senate to vote for them. With this point of view I strongly disagree.

This conference has demonstrated in the most dramatic possible manner that the American people, in their overwhelming majority, favor the ratification of the four U.N. conventions dealing with the rights of man. I am confident that, given the necessary leadership, and given a patient exposition of the facts to the Members of the Senate, the Senate will not only ratify these measures, but will do so by a very substantial majority.

And I want to pledge to you that during the months to come I shall make this one of my chief objectives both within the Foreign Relations Committee and within the Senate itself.

There is one final proposal I would like to make. Looking forward to the time when the Genocide Convention has been ratified, I think we must start thinking in terms of practical measures to make it effective.

As the convention now reads, each nation ratifying the convention undertakes to enact legislation to implement the convention, and it also provides that any person charged with commission of an act of genocide should be tried by a court of the state in whose territory the act was committed.

These articles of the convention, in my opinion, constitute the most effective answer to those who charge that ratification of the convention would result in a surrender of our sovereignty to some unnamed and nonexistent international tribunal. But the articles leave something to be desired because it is questionable whether any Communist states can be trusted to prosecute their own nationals for the crime of genocide. And it is also questionable whether any state, Communist or democratic, will, in our lifetime, voluntarily agree to submit matters of such significance to the judgment of an international tribunal. I believe this is so despite the fact that no democratic state has practiced genocide or will practice it.

How then can we give effect to the Genocide Convention?

There is an approach to this problem which would involve no surrender of national jurisdiction, but which would be more effective as a deterrent to genocide than the present provisions of the treaty.

The United Nations has been at its best when it has been a matter of setting up an investigative committee to establish the facts in countries like Greece, or Hungary, or South Africa, or Borneo, or Vietnam. Invariably, these committees have reported objectively and fearlessly.

When the Genocide Convention is ratified, I would like to propose that serious thought be given to establishing a continuing investigative mechanism within the United Nations, under which serious allegations of genocide would lead to the appointment of special committees with the instruction to investigate and report back.

The member nations of the U.N. would be obligated to cooperate with such committees in any investigations conducted on their territory. The committees would have no juridical power, nor would the U.N. itself. But the mere power of investigation—the power to seek out the facts and bring them to public light—would, in my opinion, operate as a powerful deterrent to genocidal crimes and to other violations of human rights.

If the U.N. could be endowed with this responsibility by the consent of its member nations, it would give the world organization new meaning and a new lease on life.

I submit these thoughts for your consideration because I am confident that the Genocide Convention will be ratified, and the time is, therefore, arriving when we must begin to think of next steps.

I wish you godspeed in your deliberations.

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is particularly fitting that the Senate should pay tribute to the Greek nation on the occasion of the 144th anniversary of its independence.

I say this because this body, as it is constituted and as the Senate carries out its duties, as well as other institutions in our Republic, might not exist were it not for the great heritage of Hellenic culture. For this is the culture which has in large measure shaped the ideals on which the best of our ways of life is based.

As brave men of other nations pioneered in exploring our physical world, the intellectual giants of ancient Greece pioneered in that fascinating territory of the mind of man.

There are few areas of modern political, spiritual, and cultural life that do not have their roots in concepts discussed and promulgated in the marketplaces of Athens.

The debt of the Western World to Greece is not entirely for these contributions of the mind, however, as we have in the course of the history of this century had many occasions to be grateful to these brave people for being our allies in resisting common oppressors.

On this day 144 years ago the Greeks began a struggle, which was to last for 6 years, to end the domination imposed by their Ottoman conquerors. This effort culminated in 1827 in the establishment of an independent Greek state.

The stalwart Greek people since that momentous day in their history have resisted the threats and arms of would-be aggressors. Because of this, we look to Greece as a protector and defender of our cherished liberties.

In recent years, Greece successfully resisted and repulsed the Communists who attempted to infiltrate their country during a period of dissension after World War II. Since that time, they have been one of our stanchest allies in the cold war and a valuable NATO member.

The individualistic Greek character is evident today in the vitality, creativity, and skills of immigrants from that country. Our country is richer today because of the industry and leadership these people and their descendants have contributed to America.

I hope that our efforts to liberalize the immigration statutes will be successful this year. To a greater degree then our doors again will be opened wide so that

we can benefit more fully from the talent and skills of the Greek people.

At this time last year, Greece and her friends were mourning the death of King Paul, who had led the nation with so much courage during the difficult days of World War II and during the postwar years when the Communists threatened expansion into the Mediterranean area.

It is heartening to know that young King Constantine is carrying on in the tradition of his father. And so today, in extending congratulations to Greece on their Independence Day, we also wish the country and their young ruler the best for many, many years to come.

MANAGED NEWS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, not long ago the press of America rose up in righteous anger over what it called "managed news" from the Federal Government. The press adopted the position that it can best serve the interests of the reading public by presenting or interpreting the facts without Government direction.

I subscribe to this idea and I am opposed to the concept of "managed news." Yet, I wonder if the public is aware that a startlingly large segment of the press is itself guilty of a curious double standard in this regard. It accomplishes this through what might be called the "managed editorial." In the trade, I understand this is referred to more inelegantly as "boilerplate." This is the practice whereby an organization will prepare an editorial on a given subject and mail it to newspapers across the Nation, frequently in a form where all the editor need do is drop it into the right sized hole in his paper. Needless to say, the editorial is written to advance the cause of the organization which furnishes it.

I am sure everyone is aware that an editorial is opinion, and that it need not be based on facts, or even logic. Therefore, I would not question the right of newspaper editors to adopt the views that appear in these "canned editorials."

However, a serious question can be raised regarding the journalistic ethics and integrity of an editor who would foist these "canned pearls of wisdom" onto his readers without citing the source. If the editor wants to parrot the views of the National Association of Manufacturers or the chamber of commerce he is at full liberty to do so. But should he not owe it to his readers to tell them he is doing so?

The practice I have described is not new. However, we seldom have an opportunity to see the technique clearly in action. But now we have that opportunity, and for it we are indebted to—of all people—the American Medical Association.

Recently I received in my office a 171-page book entitled "U.S. Newspapers Comment on Health Care for the Elderly." I am sure every congressional office received a copy. The foreword states that the book contains "a cross section of American newspaper editorial opposition to medicare and support of the eldercare bill." The bill, of course, is the one sponsored by the AMA. The foreword notes that the editorials "represent only a sampling of newspaper opinion," and the AMA, in "respectfully submitting the book," concludes:

> We believe that the opinions expressed in these newspapers reflect the viewpoint of a majority of the American people on this important domestic issue.

Those are the words of the AMA. And after glancing through the book one cannot help but wonder how many of the editorials also are the words of the AMA.

One need not leaf very far in the book before a curious pattern emerges.

An editor in Mesa, Ariz., for example, seems to have hit on the very same words to denounce medicare, as an editor in Aiken, S.C. Or the views of the Modesto, Calif., editor coincide precisely with those of the editor in Roanoke, Va.

Such unanimity of opinion would seem to be a rare thing. But is it?

On page 16 we come across an editorial that begins:

> The American Medical Association has offered Congress a program of health care for the elderly which merits thoughtful consideration by Members of Congress.

Oddly enough, we find the same editorial on page 61, page 74, page 78, and so on. At least 11 different, widely scattered newspapers in the AMA "sample" used the same editorial.

Another "managed editorial" begins:

> It is generally conceded that a measure providing health services for the over-65 age group will be passed by Congress this session.

At least 10 newspapers carried that one.

Still another begins:

> One wonders how many people—and especially those in the 65-and-over age group—actually know what medicare would or would not do.

Well, Mr. President, one might better wonder whether the readers had any idea where this canned editorial came from—or that it had appeared in at least 10 newspapers in the AMA sample.

Altogether at least six different versions of AMA-slanted editorials show up in the AMA's collection, and these were used by more than 50 newspapers.

The packaged material appears occasionally under the byline of a local reporter, and in one instance an editorial is referred to by a paper as a "Washington exclusive."

It was so exclusive that only six or seven other newspapers cited in the AMA book used the identical language.

I have not attempted to find out where these particular canned editorials originated, but I am sure the answer would produce no great surprises. The pattern speaks for itself.

A smoothly functioning, well-financed propaganda machine is at work here, pumping out prepackaged and predigested ideas for consumption by unsuspecting newspaper readers.

I do not know whether these packaged editorials appear because a harried editor needs to fill space, because of pressure from his county medical association, or because he is genuinely swayed by the arguments. The point is that the practice does exist—and it is deceitful.

I was pleased to note, parenthetically, that no Michigan newspapers snapped at the AMA bait. Although a few Michigan newspaper editorials appeared in the AMA collection, they appeared to be individual efforts, independently arrived at.

Up to the present, the AMA's boilerplate attack has not been very successful. Every reputable public opinion poll published in recent years has shown that an overwhelming majority of Americans favor the administration's medicare program.

But I call this to the attention of the Senate on the chance that some Senators, busy with other matters and lacking the time to delve below the surface of the AMA's latest propaganda effort, might take at face value the AMA's claim that this is a representative sampling of newspaper editorial sentiment.

The people who write to me, and to whom I talk in Michigan, are much better barometers of public opinion than all the canned editorials the AMA can collect.

But that does not excuse the practice nor some of the press for engaging in it.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS HEARINGS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the statements made by Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, by Prof. Paul W. McCracken, of the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Michigan, former member of the Council of Economic Advisers, and by Prof. Fritz Machlup, of Princeton University, before the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Banking and Currency Committee.

These statements contain important discussions of the issues involved in these hearings, and I believe it would be helpful to the Senate and to the country to make them available in this way.

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

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM MCCHESNEY MARTIN, JR., CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MARCH 10, 1965

For the second time in less than 2 years, a national program to reduce and eventually eliminate our large international payments deficit has been launched. Our first program, begun with President Kennedy's message to Congress of July 18, 1963, met for a time with a measure of success, but in the course of last year, signs of fresh deterioration appeared. The fourth quarter of 1964 brought a near-record payments deficit. During the first 6 weeks of 1965 tentative and fragmentary data indicated that a similar deficit was threatening for the first quarter of the current year.

The need for more vigorous action was clear. President Johnson's program of February 10, 1965, was in response to this challenge. For an important part of the program, the President called upon the Federal Reserve to assume major responsibility. Accordingly, we have now communicated to the

commercial banks and other financial institutions of this country guidelines for a voluntary effort to restrain their foreign lending.

It may be helpful to you in the course of my statement to explain briefly the approach to our international payments problem followed by the Federal Reserve in laying down its guidelines.

The magnitude of our payments deficit is determined by three main factors: First, the commercial balance on goods and services; second, our military expenditures abroad and our economic aid to foreign countries; and, third, the net outflow of our private capital into foreign countries. The President's program attacks the deficit on all three fronts. But as the Federal Reserve is not asked to deal with Government expenditures, my comments will be directed primarily to problems on commercial account and private capital account.

It cannot be stressed too often, in my opinion, that the main contribution of monetary policy both to our continued domestic expansion and to the restoration of our international payments equilibrium is the maintenance of credit conditions that help bring about cost and price stability. Avoidance of both inflation and deflation not only averts one of the main perils to sustainable economic growth; it is also indispensable to preservation and improvement of the international competitive position of our industries at home and in world markets.

The further expansion of our commercial surplus depends on continued avoidance of cost and price increases—although, needless to say, many other factors, such as the level of economic activity at home and abroad, also play important roles.

By providing monetary conditions favorable to price stability, Federal Reserve policy has, in my judgment, been as successful as could be expected in furthering a satisfactory development of our payments balance on current account. I do not want to minimize the importance of some signs pointing toward renewed upward cost and price pressures. As I said in my testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on February 26, I cannot avoid the feeling that we have been, and still are, sailing very close to the edge in this area. But the overall changes up to now in per unit costs of production, in wholesale prices, and in the cost of living, have so far not imperiled our international trade performance.

With regard to the Federal Reserve's contribution to minimizing outflows on capital account, the matter, unfortunately, is not quite so simple. While our commercial balance has shown record surpluses, our capital account has shown record deficits. The total net private U.S. capital outflows in 1964 amount to over $6 billion—twice as much as our total payments deficit—and the net expansion of bank credit to foreigners alone accounted for more than one-third of this capital outflow.

As a matter of principle, the aim of Federal Reserve policy is to maintain monetary conditions that are conducive to an adequate supply of credit and capital. This means a supply large enough to finance continuing economic expansion domestically without inflation, but not so generous as to make possible either an unsustainable investment boom or an undue spillover of funds to foreign countries.

The supply of credit and capital in recent years, in my judgment, certainly has been large enough to meet all legitimate domestic financing needs. It has so far not given rise to an unsustainable boom—although developments in some fields such as construction need to be carefully watched. But our monetary policy has permitted credit in the United States to remain relatively cheap and plentiful in comparison with other major markets, and thus has been a factor in the magnitude of our private capital outflow.

While this capital outflow has played an important part in swelling our payments deficit, we must remain mindful that the United States is and will probably continue in the future to be an important source of credit and capital for the rest of the world. As the richest and most productive nation of the world, the United States is capable of generating the largest supply of savings, both in absolute terms and in relation to national income. Our accumulated stock of invested capital is also larger than that of any other country, again both in absolute amounts and in relation to national product. Hence, our domestic demand for new investment is relatively less urgent than in most if not all foreign countries. With a larger supply and a somewhat less strong demand than in other countries, the availability of credit and capital, will tend to be greater, and the cost of credit and capital lower, than in the rest of the world.

This is not an unusual situation. In previous periods, the same relation obtained with respect to those nations that happened to be in the economic and financial lead for their time. France, the Low Countries, and especially Britain were for many generations a continuing source of credit and capital for the rest of the world, and during those periods their interest rate levels were naturally lower than in borrowing countries.

It is clear that restoration of our foreign payments equilibrium does not require our capital outflow to come to anything like a full stop. Arithmetically, a cutback in our private capital outflow of about one-half of the 1964 volume would suffice to wipe out the entire payments deficit provided all other elements in the payments balance remained the same. Realistically, it would be both impracticable and unwise to put the entire burden of correcting the payments deficit on private financing.

The main problem confronting the Federal Reserve—and our Nation at large—is how to reduce the net outflow of credit and capital without at the same time constricting the domestic supply so much that financing needed for our expanding economy at stable prices is unduly impeded.

Two alternative courses of policy are available to cope with this problem: One, a general increase in the cost and a lessening of the availability of credit; and the other, specific action designed to cut only the supply of credit and capital to foreigners without impinging on the needed supply to the domestic economy.

The Federal Reserve has to some extent followed the traditional course of the first alternative. At the time President Kennedy was formulating his program and in the prospect of its early announcement, the Federal Reserve shifted its policy posture in the direction of less domestic ease and increased its discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent, and shortly after lifted the ceiling interest rate on time deposits in the maturity range of 90 days to 1 year to 4 percent. These actions were promptly reflected in financial markets. Within a few weeks the Treasury bill rate had risen by more than one-half a percentage point and over ensuing months long-term interest rates drifted upward by just over one-eighth of a point.

These upward shifts in the level of domestic interest rates went some distance in better alining our interest rates with those in foreign markets. Through the second half of 1963 and the early months of 1964, this alinement continued tolerably satisfactory. About this time, in major industrial countries abroad, strong credit demands accompanying strong economic growth and creeping inflation were carrying foreign interest rates to levels fully offsetting the advances that had been experienced in U.S. markets. In recognition of the pull that the higher foreign rates might exert on our credit supplies, the Federal Reserve in August firmed domestic money market conditions slightly further, with the result that the Treasury bill rate moved modestly above the discount rate.

Under continued pressure of inflationary trends abroad, however, the availability of credit came under increasing central bank restraint in various foreign markets. In these circumstances, capital outflow from the United States accelerated.

About the time we were experiencing this mounting capital outflow, an adverse payments balance for the United Kingdom put the pound sterling under strong pressure in international markets, resulting in large drains on Britain's monetary reserves. That country was obliged to take a number of emergency steps, including the establishment by its central bank of a discount rate of 7 percent. To support the pound in international markets, the Bank of England arranged for a $1 billion drawing on the IMF along with about $3 billion of credits with other central banks.

In view of uncertainties which developed at this point in international financial markets and in recognition of the advances in short-term rates that had been occurring in other international markets, the Federal Reserve raised its discount rate last November from 3½ to 4 percent. At the same time, ceilings on the interest rates that banks are permitted to pay on time deposits of over 90 days were raised to 4.5 percent. Short-term rates in our money market promptly moved upward further about a quarter of a percent in adjustment to these changes; long-term rates, however, continued to fluctuate narrowly within the range they had moved since the beginning of 1963, reflecting the continued large flow of domestic savings.

It is impossible to say how large the capital outflow in the fourth quarter might have been if we had not taken the actions when we did. All that we now know is that in spite of whatever inhibiting effect may have come from these actions and the accompanying increase in short rates, there was a further rise in lending and investing abroad.

Nevertheless, we have not moved further in the traditional way to constrain our renewed capital outflow. Considering the desirability of further reducing our level of unemployment and more fully utilizing our resources, we have risked permitting some spillover of funds into foreign uses, and have sought other, more selective means of coping with the outflow problem.

There are three selective ways by which capital outflow can be reduced: by tax measures; by exchange controls; or by enlistment of voluntary cooperation.

The interest equalization tax is an example of the first approach. Experience with this approach so far has indicated both its strength and weakness. It is generally agreed that a tax is more consistent with the principles on which our economy is based than would be the use of direct controls or an appeal to voluntary cooperation. But a tax statute can hardly avoid some opportunities for legal escape, since it is extremely difficult in legislative drafting to foresee all loophole possibilities. Too embracing a tax, with many exceptions and qualifications, could be so complicated to administer that its effectiveness would be seriously impaired.

Exchange controls have not been tried in the past, except under wartime conditions, and I, for one, hope they will not be tried. By shifting decisionmaking in individual business transactions from participants to some Government agency, this approach would be repugnant to the principles of our economic system. Also, experience everywhere has shown that exchange regulations, if couched in general terms, can be avoided as easily as a special tax; and if elaborated in great detail, become so oppressive that

they also hamper business activities beneficial to our payments situation. And once this route has been chosen, experience has demonstrated the difficulty of retracing one's steps towards freedom from controls. Of the three methods of selective restraint, exchange controls are, in my judgment, the one that should not be seriously contemplated.

This leaves for comment the voluntary approach. This method also has shortcomings. The person, individual or corporate, adhering to a voluntary program, may be penalized in favor of an uncooperative person. But if widespread voluntary restraint can reasonably be expected, the method has three advantages: first, it leaves the ultimate decision to the market participants; second, it is flexible enough to take care of changing circumstances and of the experience gained in the process; and third, given the good faith of all parties, it avoids the encumbrance of legalistic interpretations of the rules of the game.

With regard to the expansion of credits to foreigners granted by banks and other financial institutions, the prospects of general compliance with voluntary efforts are particularly good because a comparatively few institutions account for the great bulk of the total funds involved. And the response the Federal Reserve has encountered in its initial efforts to implement the President's program has been quite encouraging.

Last week, the Federal Reserve issued its guidelines to the banks and to other financial institutions. The guidelines provide that any bank may expand its credit to foreigners by 5 percent of the amount outstanding at the end of 1964. Such a figure is consistent with the expected growth of our national product and also the expected growth of international trade. But it is much smaller than was the rate of last year's credit outflow. All of us realize that the restraint asked for may create hardship in individual cases.

Our guidelines, which are directed to each bank individually, are designed to distribute the burden as equitably as possible and to avoid unnecessary inconvenience. In particular, they are designed to avert any adverse repercussions on our international commerce; on sound development efforts of less developed countries; and on such countries as Canada and Japan, which are largely dependent on U.S. financing, and Britain, which is suffering from serious payments difficulties of its own.

We expect that banks will continue to grant bona fide export credits; such credits are to be given absolute priority. Obviously, no priority can be claimed for credit extensions that substitute a credit sale for a cash sale or that substitute financing by U.S. banks for financing from nonbank or foreign resources.

We also expect that banks will continue to finance sound development projects of less developed countries. But clearly a less developed country should not rely on U.S. credit for projects that can and should be financed either with the country's own resources, or by other industrial nations—e.g., where the project envisages imports from European suppliers.

The guidelines explicitly state that substantial cutbacks are expected only in nonexport credits to those fully developed countries that are not customarily dependent on U.S. financing and that do not suffer from payments difficulties. Most if not all continental European countries should fall into this category.

The guidelines for nonbank financial institutions are more general and tentative in their specifications. They envisage cutbacks in the placement of liquid funds abroad, primarily in the so-called Euro-dollar market. In the case of short- and medium-term credits, the guidelines for banks are in effect applicable to nonbanks. But in the case of long-term credits (with a maturity of 5 years or more), which are probably more important in the case of nonbanks than of banks, no specific target has been set. Most longer term credits to fully developed countries are subject to the interest equalization tax. No effort is being made to discourage continued long-term investments in less developed countries, which need this type of assistance more urgently than additional bank credits.

While I am optimistic about the effectiveness of the voluntary restraint efforts, it would be impossible to give any quantitative estimate of their probable impact on our payments balance this year. Some banks greatly increased their credits to foreigners during the first 6 weeks of this year; some made very heavy advance commitments which they will have to honor; some carry many long-term credits among their outstanding assets, on which only small repayments are expected this year; others expect to have to increase their export credits and their loans to less developed countries without being able immediately to reduce sufficiently their nonexport credits to industrial countries. Banks that find themselves in such predicaments as these have been given 12 months to reduce their outstanding credits to no more than 105 percent of the 1964 level.

Moreover, we realize that in spite of all good will and vigilance some leakage will occur, in the sense that nonbanking institutions may grant some credits customarily granted by banks. The effect of such leakage on the overall reduction of nonbank credits to foreigners cannot be predicted at this stage.

For the moment, we appear to be making good progress indeed. But of course, the real test of the program lies ahead. Meanwhile, I should not like to say more than that we expect the net expansion of both bank credit and total credit to foreigners to be reduced this year by a substantial amount.

This reduction in capital outflows will be welcome. But in itself it will not be sufficient to assure the success of the President's program. For that, two things more are required; a further increase in our export surplus and a further decrease in our Government expenditures abroad. To borrow a word from the other side of the Iron Curtain, the program is like a troika, which cannot move if only one of its three horses keeps going.

Since I envisage success for the program, there is not need for me to dwell on actions that might become necessary if the program were not as successful as expected. But the inference from the analysis of the situation is unequivocal. With exchange controls decidedly inadvisable, and with tax measures unlikely to be more effective than voluntary action, a return to the traditional recipe of further restraint may be necessary in the monetary sphere, as may be further restraint in the spheres of military expenditures, economic aid and tourism.

But even if the program of voluntary cooperation achieves the greatest possible degree of success, we cannot think of it as a permanent institution. This program can serve as a dike for a period of time, but still farther ahead we have to look for a more basic adjustment of our international payments balance. The better we succeed in keeping our industries competitive in international commerce, and the better we succeed in reducing our Government payments abroad, the less we will need to be concerned about our capital outflow, and the sooner we can return to a system that leaves balance on capital account to the forces of a free market.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL W. McCRACKEN, PROFESSOR, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, MARCH 16, 1965

Mr. Chairman, if we look through the tops of our bifocals at the enormous amount of discussion in recent years about our balance-of-payments problem, we find three broad approaches to a diagnosis.

EXCHANGE RATE ADJUSTMENTS

First, there is the view that the dollar is overvalued, and an adjustment in the exchange rate will be required to restore equilibrium. I do not propose to say much about this for two reasons. The evidence does not yet suggest that the dollar is overvalued internationally. Even with AID exports excluded our exports exceed our imports by a comfortable margin. Moreover, a downward adjustment of our exchange rate relative to other currencies is not only not called for, but probably is not even possible. Certainly the British could not tolerate an appreciation of the pound relative to the dollar, and it is doubtful if such other countries as Japan, Canada, or even many continental European countries would thus acquiesce in having their international competitive position relative to the United States adversely affected. There is little point in putting on the agenda what probably should not occur and almost certainly could not take place.

At the same time it is important to bear one thing in mind. An exchange rate is a price. Through time conditions do change. Price-cost levels move differently in different countries. Patterns of demand can change. The structure of exchange rates that represent equilibrium at one point in time may not be correct for a decade or two later. Our system in some respects exposes us to the problems of both fixed and flexible rates. Rates are fixed (within tolerances of plus or minus 1 percent), but emergent nervousness about the possibility of a change can readily become a source of problems—as we were again reminded last November. The result is that our present system tends to produce crises, often preceded by varying degrees of domestic deflation and ad hoc exchange controls, and a crisis is apt to be required to force even needed adjustments in the price of one currency in terms of another. This is, in my judgment, an underrated weakness of our present international financial system. And we must find some way to get beyond the present intellectual paralysis where one who uses the term "exchange rate adjustment" is immediately suspected of thinking lewd financial thoughts.

Clearly, however, an adjustment of exchange rates is not on the agenda of desirable or even possible corrective measures, and my own concern here is with other matters.

STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS

A second diagnosis of our problem has placed particular emphasis on the pattern or structure of our international transactions. This is by now generally understood, and I need not belabor the point here. This analysis, of course, points out that our generally strong payments position is the victim of particularly large specific outflows—AID and the leakage of dollars from our military installations around the world being leading candidates. Those who emphasize the impact of these leakages, of course, recognize that technically one cannot point to any item in a balancing account, where by definition debits equal credits, as the source of the problem. If some other items had been different from what they were, the item singled out could have been what it was without causing trouble. Even so it does not strain credulity to suggest that large noncurrent outflows do complicate the problem of sustaining balance in our external

payments. And the administration has expended a good deal of effort and ingenuity in trying to moderate or neutralize these specific outflows.

EXCESSIVE LIQUIDITY

There is a third diagnosis of the problem. It places heavy stress on monetary or liquidity factors. Hydrostatic analogies come readily to mind. If a bathtub is overflowing, it is obviously overflowing at the low section of the rim. If that low section is built up, the tub will not run over there. It will, however, continue to overflow somewhere until the faucet running too much water into the tub is turned down.

We have an increasingly international market for money and capital. If the supply of liquidity is superabundant for domestic purposes, things do begin to happen. This becomes an attractive place for foreign borrowers to obtain funds. Some parent companies may prefer to use funds invested in Treasury bills here to finance more of a foreign subsidiary's requirements. U.S. corporations with surplus funds may intensify their search for acquisitions abroad as well as at home. And from time to time decisions may be made to keep some surplus funds abroad as a matter of policy. These are apt to be marginal shifts, not a 180° about-face in any corporation's policy. Even so the aggregate of marginal shifts can be consequential.

Fortunately, we do not have to choose up sides on this matter of diagnosis. One can conclude that large noncurrent dollar drains contribute to our external deficit, and at the same time conclude that a part of the problem is monetary or liquidity in its origin.

The evidence is increasingly clear that there is a monetary or liquidity dimension to this problem of disequilibrium in our external payments.

U.S. balance of payments

[In billions]

	1958	1964	Change
Balance on current transactions	$1.5	$7.3	+$5.8
U.S. Government grants and capital [1]	−2.6	−3.7	−1.1
U.S. private capital, net	−2.9	−6.2	−3.3
Foreign capital [2]		.3	+.3
Errors and unrecorded transactions	.5	−.7	−1.2
Balance, regular transactions	−3.5	−3.0	+.5

[1] Net, excluding advance debt repayments.
[2] Excluding foreign liquid assets.

Source: "Background Information on U.S. Balance of Payments," Senate Banking and Currency Committee (89th Cong., 1st sess.), 1965, pp. 2-3.

It is interesting to compare the data for 1958 and 1964. The arrangement of the data on page 2 of the "Background Information on the U.S. Balance of Payments," prepared for this committee, is useful for this purpose. In 1958, the first year of substantial deficits in our balance of payments, the gap was $3.5 billion. In the intervening years this problem received unremitting attention from the administration. Aid has been substantially tied. The Secretary of Defense has undertaken heroic efforts to supply military forces from the United States, at considerable dollar costs, and to induce offset purchases of military equipment to neutralize the payments leakage from our military units abroad. And during these 6 years there was a massive favorable shift in our balance on current transactions. Yet the overall balance in 1964, on regular transactions, was still slightly over $3 billion. There were enormous shifts in the subbalances, with the overall result disconcertingly similar to that for 1958.

We must, of course, not read too much into this similarity in overall results for these 2 years. Certainly it is reasonable to assume that in the absence of measures taken to reduce payments and to augment receipts, the 1964 performance would have been even more unfavorable than it was. At the same time the magnitude of the overflow was only moderately smaller than at the beginning of the period, and the major countershift neutralizing most of the improvement in the balance on current account was a sharp rise in capital outflows, with a particularly sharp rise in the outward movement of short-term funds. The pattern of this shift within an overall deficit that improved only moderately strongly suggests that our problem increasingly has been having a monetary or liquidity dimension.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM

Given the nature of the problem the administration's program has much to commend it. It has a quality of decisiveness and determination about it, and this has itself had a therapeutic effect. Undoubtedly most companies engaged in international commerce can, with some extra effort, improve the balance of their own international transactions. The program is also heavily designed to moderate the capital outflow, whose sharp rise has seemingly neutralized a good deal of the improvement elsewhere. The purist may have reservations about the approach, but in the real world there will always be policies implemented in ways that are not technically quite consonant with the impersonal forces of the marketplace.

At the same time there are some implications to the administration's approach to retarding the flow of capital that should be kept squarely before us. First, a system that allows increases in lending equal to a certain percentage of an institution's base-period volume is a system of allocating shares of the market. Yet it is the rivalry and competition for business, each trying to increase his share of the market, that constitute the dynamic forces producing progress, and this is true among financial institutions as well as in other markets.

Second, such a program may develop internal stresses that will erode its effectiveness through time. Cases will surely arise where businesses see (or, at least, think they see) their competitors using this restraint as an opportunity for some one-upsmanship. It will certainly occur to some that the next act in this unfolding drama is apt to include outright controls concerning the use of dollars abroad—in which case the prudent thing is to keep some funds abroad. (A colleague at the university, planning to spend his 1966 family vacation in Europe, asked if it might not be wise to have a modest deposit in some bank abroad.) It would be quite a departure from historical experience if these arrangements involved in the plan do not spawn a good many ingenious end plays. A system, in short, establishing rules of the game that make it in the interest of the business to do what is not wanted, and then asks him to do what is not in his own interest, will generate pressures that tend to devitalize its own effectiveness. This, in turn, can easily cause a moderate, voluntary program to metamorphose into a more extensive system of direct controls. We have already gone from tied aid, to supplying military units abroad (at greater cost) from the United States, to the interest equalization tax, to the Gore amendment, to the present more extensive program. This is not inconsequential distance already backward away from the liberal international trade and financial system which it was our objective to establish at the end of the war.

MONETARY POLICY IS THE KEY

These more ad hoc or direct approaches can facilitate the restoration of external equilibrium if—and, in my judgment, only if—they are backstopped by a moderately less easy credit policy than we now have. If the general monetary and credit situation were such, for example, that on the average financial institutions would not want their foreign lending to rise much beyond the specified percentage of last year's volume, the stresses and strains that could eviscerate the effectiveness of the administration's program (or gradually convert it to one of outright direct controls) can probably be kept below the threshold point. Recent moves toward a less easy credit policy will be helpful and may be adequate. In any case a moderately less rapid rate of monetary expansion is now clearly in order.

IMPACT ON DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Fortunately this is not a choice between vigorous, sustainable domestic expansion and equilibrium in our external payments. Indeed, the evidence increasingly suggests that the domestic economy could also do with a reduced rate of credit expansion. Since the fourth quarter of 1961, the money supply (including time deposits) has been increasing somewhat more rapidly than business activity. And by the final quarter of last year the ratio of the money supply to GNP was 52.1 percent. It is necessary to go back to 1955 to find a ratio of the money supply to GNP of comparable size (excluding, of course, the recession year of 1958). And from yearend 1964 to mid-February monetary expansion was at the rate of 10.4 percent per year (using here St. Louis Federal Reserve Bank data). The change in loan expansion is also impressive. Some decline in bank loans following the turn of the year is a normal seasonal development, and from yearend 1963 to early March 1964 loans at weekly reporting banks declined $1,194 million. During the same period this year there has been a contraseasonal increase of $1,217 million. Moreover this demand is widespread over the economy.

Money supply and GNP

[Dollar amounts in billions, seasonally adjusted]

Year	GNP	Money supply	
		Amount	Percent GNP
1955—1st quarter	384.3	$207.1	0.539
2d quarter	393.0	208.6	.531
3d quarter	403.4	210.0	.521
4th quarter	408.9	211.0	.516
1956—1st quarter	410.6	212.0	.516
2d quarter	415.0	213.6	.515
3d quarter	421.0	214.5	.510
4th quarter	430.0	215.7	.502
1957—1st quarter	438.5	218.4	.498
2d quarter	442.1	220.3	.498
3d quarter	448.3	221.7	.494
4th quarter	442.3	222.0	.502
1958—1st quarter	432.9	224.7	.519
2d quarter	437.2	229.7	.525
3d quarter	447.0	233.5	.522
4th quarter	460.6	235.9	.512
1959—1st quarter	472.0	238.7	.505
2d quarter	487.8	241.0	.511
3d quarter	482.7	242.2	.502
4th quarter	488.5	241.3	.494
1960—1st quarter	500.4	241.1	.482
2d quarter	504.1	241.2	.478
3d quarter	503.5	243.7	.484
4th quarter	502.1	246.6	.491
1961—1st quarter	500.4	250.6	.501
2d quarter	512.5	257.3	.502
3d quarter	521.9	260.8	.500
4th quarter	537.8	264.4	.492
1962—1st quarter	544.5	269.4	.495
2d quarter	552.4	274.4	.497
3d quarter	556.8	277.8	.499
4th quarter	565.2	283.8	.502
1963—1st quarter	571.8	290.3	.508
2d quarder	577.4	295.4	.517
3d quarter	587.2	300.1	.511
4th quarter	599.0	306.9	.512
1964—1st quarter	608.8	312.9	.514
2d quarter	618.6	317.9	.514
3d quarter	628.4	324.0	.516
4th quarter	634.6	330.8	.521

Source: Federal Reserve and Department of Commerce. Money supply includes time deposits.

I do not myself attach any mystical significance to monetary matters, and I do not regard myself as one who finds tight money and high interest rates inherently good things. At the same time the diffused na-

ture of routes by which monetary changes exert their effects on business activity suggests that there is a significant lag between these monetary changes and the visible effect of these changes on the economy. In 1954–56 we saw the effect of a monetary policy that was too easy too long followed by a policy that became quite tight, too tight, trying to cope with an expansion that finally generated quite a head of steam.

Change in commercial and industrial loans at weekly reporting banks

[In millions of dollars]

Borrowers	Dec. 31, 1963, to Mar. 4, 1964	Dec. 30, 1964, to Mar. 3, 1965[1]
Manufacturing	−314	718
Durable	−14	439
Nondurable	−300	279
Mining	−206	152
Trade	−344	413
All other	−330	−66
Total	−1,194	+1,217

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Federal Reserve.

In the interests of keeping the domestic expansion orderly and vigorous, the monetary expansion in 1965 should be discernibly less than last year. And this is precisely what would also be helpful in restoring external equilibrium also. It is to be hoped that the administration, which has shown commendable determination about other aspects of the problem, will not jeopardize their own program by insistence that monetary policy remain frozen at its present posture. This committee could play an enormously constructive role by recognizing explicitly that there are times when the responsible execution of monetary policy requires shifts toward reduced rate of credit expansion.

Let me emphasize that I do not urge this because of greater concern about the international position of the dollar than for full employment at home. Ours has traditionally been a full employment economy, and it must continue to be. (There is no other period in this century when we have had such sustained unemployment as since 1958, except, of course, the great depression.) At the same time moving from 5 to 4 percent unemployment will require a more delicate performance from economic policy than when we were trying to get from 6 to 5 percent. Now there are bottlenecks that must widened, sensitive prices have been rising, some labor markets already have shortages. A policy of keeping the credit accelerator to the floor would increasingly court the risk of disorderly developments and an unnecessarily abrupt subsequent shift to tight money that could easily, as in 1957, throw us into another reversal.

A major rationale for tax reduction (which I have urged in and out of Government since early 1958), was to give the economy a stimulus, at the same time leaving us freer to adapt monetary policy and monetary conditions to the international financial and economic environment. The time has come to use some of that freedom we thereby gained.

IMPORTANCE OF STABLE COST-PRICE LEVEL

One final point. If events of recent years teach us one thing it is the crucial importance of a reasonably stable cost-price level. We see this in our own experience. In the mid-1950's cost-raising wage settlements, followed by announced price increases, became an annual Sadie Hawkins day ritual for many industries. Inflation-mindedness became pervasive, we entered upon a period of persisting unemployment, and our balance of current transactions in our external accounts by 1959 was negative. While economic policy was too deflationary from 1957 to 1959, this disinflationary policy did establish the basis for more favorable developments since. We have had vigorous expansion, our price-cost level has been quite stable, and we have had an impressive improvement in our balance on current transactions. If that inflation and inflation-mindedness of the 1950's had not been squelched, devaluation of the dollar would probably have occurred by now. Those who deplore the disinflationary policies of 1957 and 1959 (and, let me repeat, they were probably unnecessarily restrictive) must not overlook the fact that the better recent performance of the economy is the beneficiary of those earlier actions.

Increase in exports and export prices

[In percent]

Country	Export prices	Value of exports
1953 TO 1963		
Japan	−11	123
Italy	−9	73
France	−3	35
Switzerland	−1	25
Netherlands	1	45
Average of 5	−4	60
Sweden	2	40
Canada	3	17
Germany	3	100
United States	6	13
United Kingdom	9	26
Average of 5	5	39
1958 TO 1963		
Italy	−5	92
Canada	−4	26
France	−2	59
Japan		90
Sweden	2	52
Average of 5	−2	64
United States	2	30
United Kingdom	4	28
Netherlands	4	55
Germany	6	66
Switzerland	7	60
Average of 5	5	47

Source: International Financial Statistics.

We also see the importance of maintaining a stable cost-price level as we look more broadly at international experience in the last decade. The decade happens to divide at the point where our own payments deficit widened, and about the point at which major currencies became convertible. It may, therefore, be useful to look at each half of the decade separately. Suppose we examine the export experience of 10 industrial nations. In the first half of the decade the five nations with the best export-price performance had an average increase in exports of 60 percent. The five with smaller increases in export prices had an average increase in exports of 60 percent. The five with larger increases in export prices had an average increase in exports of only 39 percent. From 1958 to 1963 the same pattern is indicated. The five nations with the better price performance again experienced a larger export gain than those with less favorable export price developments.

Actually export price comparisons probably understate the extent to which our international competitive position has improved in recent years. The rise in domestic price levels abroad relative to the rise here has been far greater than the differential change in export prices. The 8-percent rise in the cost of living here since 1958 is lower than that of any other country in the table and compares well with increases elsewhere ranging up to 35 percent in Japan. The rise in these domestic price levels has undoubtedly opened up opportunities for U.S. exports, and has been a part of our strong export performance in recent years.

Cost of Living Index, December 1964
(1958=100)

Country:	*Index*
Canada	109
France	130
Germany	115
Italy	127
Japan	135
Netherlands	117
Sweden	121
Switzerland	115
United Kingdom	118
United States	108

Source: International Financial Statistics. Index is for December of the latest month available.

At the same time there is little in the data to suggest that the price of strength in world markets is a retarded, arthritic domestic economy. The nations with relatively large gains in exports tended to be those with particularly vigorous economies at home—e.g., Italy, Japan, and Germany. And the economies with a relatively poor export performance were those whose domestic economies were also sluggish. This is reasonable. The dynamic, innovative, aggressive economies are the ones that we would expect to grow both at home and in external markets.

CONCLUSION

There is much in recent developments that is encouraging. Our balance of current transactions is highly favorable. We are, therefore, spared the agonizing problems that arise with an intractable lag of exports behind imports. This critically important recovery of strength since 1959 in our balance on current account is a major dividend from our having maintained a reasonably stable cost-price level in recent years, and the basis for this was established with the disinflationary policies of the mid-1950's.

The major item on the agenda of unfinished business now is to reduce moderately the rate of credit expansion. This, as it happens, is also desirable in order to keep the domestic expansion sustainable and orderly. And a moderately less easy credit policy is also essential if the actions now being taken to implement the administration's program are not to generate internal strains that either erode the program or lead us still further down the road of capital and exchange controls, an inconvertible dollar, and an increasingly illiberal international trade and financial system.

STATEMENT OF DR. FRITZ MACHLUP, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCE, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, U.S. SENATE, MARCH 17, 1965

I suppose that we all have learned that no one can forecast the balance of payments of next year or any future period. Too often have the attempted forecasts by Government departments or private experts proved wrong. While we can usually know in what direction a particular event, measure, or change will affect the external balance, there are too many variables involved to permit reasonably accurate predictions of the net outcome. Our inability to predict does not reduce the significance of research and analysis in international finance. There are enough important connections and relations about which we know a good deal and may learn more.

THE SIZE OF THE DEFICIT

One thing that many have had a hard time understanding but have finally learned is that the accounting balance of payments may be calculated in many different ways and, hence, that the size of the surplus or deficit is not uniquely determined. In order to distinguish balances measured by different arrangements of accounts and items, experts

have proposed a bewildering nomenclature by adding to the "current balance" and the "capital balance," a "basic balance," a "regular transactions balance," an "official settlement balance," an "overall balance," an "exchange market balance," and a few more. While this may confuse the layman, it helps to make it clear to him that he cannot comprehend the issues involved.

There was a controversy between two administrative departments because the most widely publicized balance showed a greater deficit than would be shown under a different arrangement of accounts. In particular, if increases in dollar holdings of private foreigners were included in the regular capital balance as an inflow of foreign short-term capital, rather than treated as a way of financing a deficit of U.S. payments, the reported deficit would look much less threatening. The sound and fury about this issue is understandable only if one believes that important decisions in international finance are influenced by reports about the exact size of the U.S. deficit. Personally I doubt this. But those who believe it point to the fact that liquid dollar holdings by private foreign individuals, firms, and banks now amount to about $14 billion. The U.S. deficit in the years in which these holdings were built up would have been that much smaller had it been calculated by the method used by most European governments. Again, I do not think that statistical reporting or accounting procedures can ultimately affect the actual flow of funds among nations.

The greatest surprise to the layman comes with the statement that a deficit in the U.S. balance need not indicate anything about the position of the U.S. dollar and that, for example, the same deficit may at one time be a welcome relief of a world dollar shortage, but at another time an embarrassing deterioration of a dollar glut. The layman's shock can be mitigated by telling him that the demand for dollars to hold—the demand, that is, by private foreign parties and by official foreign authorities for liquid dollar assets in the form of balances with American banks or securities of the U.S. Government—cannot be seen from any accounting statement. There is dollar shortage when foreign authorities buy dollars with great eagerness and there is dollar glut when they buy dollars with reluctance; the balance of international payments may be exactly the same in both situations. And just as there can be dollar shortage with a deficit in U.S. payments, a dollar glut may exist with a surplus. The first situation, dollar shortage despite a U.S. deficit, existed in the early 1950's: the latter situation, dollar glut despite a U.S. surplus, may arise when the United States attains a surplus in its balance of payments while foreign parties, official or private, still feel that they hold more dollars than they want.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE DEFICIT

The worst misses in governmental forecasting were due to the fact that the officials concentrated on particular deficit items and believed that the deficit would disappear or decrease if these items were chopped down. But, alas, the balance of payments has behaved like the mythical Hydra, growing more ugly heads for each head successfully chopped off.

In 1958 the overall balance on regular transactions showed a deficit of $3.5 billion. From that year to 1964, merchandise exports increased by $8.8 billion, private income from foreign investment increased by $2.5 billion, the sum of sales of goods and all services increased by $13.3 billion, military expenditures were reduced by $600 million, and the entire balance on current transactions improved by $5.8 billion. Yet the deficit in 1964, measured the same way as in 1958, was still over $3 billion.

Evidently the strong improvement of the current balance was offset by an increase in the deficit of the capital balance. The increase in net capital outflows looks especially bad if most of the inflow of foreign short-term capital is excluded from the net capital balance—and, as we know, the Commerce Department reports do not include the acquisition of liquid dollar assets by foreigners in the regular capital balance. But in any case, looking only at the movements of private U.S. capital, the changes in recent years are quite conspicuous. Comparing the same 2 years as before, the outflow of private U.S. capital increased from $2.9 billion in 1958 to $6.2 billion in 1964—that is, by $3.3 billion.

It may be tempting to take a sharp sword and chop off this particular head of the Hydra. Can it be done without causing substitute heads to grow? No one can be sure. It is quite possible that a forced reduction in the deficit on capital account will cause a reduction in the surplus on current account. If every dollar that is forcefully kept from being sent abroad for direct investment, portfolio or other long-term investment, or for acquiring various kinds of short-term assets, were invested in the United States, in addition to what would be invested in any case, we should expect a deterioration of our current balance. On the other hand, if the dollars which are kept at home (because of the wishes of our Government) are then kept idle, or are kept from being created by the banking system, then the improvement in the capital balance need not cause a deterioration of the current balance. (Some analysts of feedback effects ask themselves what the foreigners do with the money they receive and cannot do if they do not receive it, but fail also to ask what the Americans do with the money which they are prevented from transferring.)

The interrelationships between the different accounts of the balance of payments are rather complicated, but this is no excuse for disregarding them altogether. Too often must we see that some of our official experts fail to anticipate these interrelations. The belief, for example, that a reduction in direct investments abroad will fully be reflected in an improvement in the balance of payments is naive.

My diagnosis, after examining the various items in the outflow of capital, leads me to the conclusion that a reduction of some items would lead to a reduction in the surplus on current account, whereas a reduction of other items would not affect the current balance. We shall come back to this point after looking at the breakdown of the U.S. capital account.

OUTFLOWS OF PRIVATE U.S. CAPITAL IN 1964

The statement of the Secretary of the Treasury before this subcommittee on March 9 gives, in table 8, the date on the outflow of U.S. private capital during 1964, both for the first three quarters (January to September) and for the entire year. It is important to note that the outflow picked up considerable momenum during the last quarter.

Direct investments had been $1.5 billion during the first three quarters. The figure for the year is $2.2 billion. This means that the outflow on this score was $700 million during the fourth quarter, which is an annual rate of $2.8 billion, or an increase of 40 percent over the annual rate of the first three quarters.

The purchase of foreign securities was $200 million in the first three quarters, but $700 million for the entire year. Thus, the outflow on this account was $500 million during the last quarter, which is an annual rate of $2 billion, compared with an annual rate of less than $267 million during the first three quarters. The increase is 650 percent.

Other long-term capital outflows were $800 million in the first three quarters and $1.3 billion for the entire year. This means an outflow at an annual rate of $2 billion during the last quarter, compared to an annual rate of $1.06 billion during the first three quarters. The increase is 89 percent.

The short-term capital outflow was $1.4 billion in the first three quarters, but $2 billion for the entire year. This means an annual rate of $2.4 billion during the last quarter, against $1.9 billion during the first three quarters. The increase is 26 percent.

It stands to reason that this enormous gain of momentum in the last quarter of the year cannot be entirely due to seasonal factors but occurred chiefly under the influence of expectational factors, probably in increased fear of a devaluation of the dollar and a fear of restrictions on the transfer of funds.

If it is true that the increase in capital outflow was motivated by expectational factors, one could draw the following inferences:

1. Wrong expectations can often be reversed by pronouncement and actions that demonstrate the expectations to be unjustified.

2. If expectations are reversed, not only will further capital outflows motivated by the wrong expectations be stopped, but capital may start flowing in the opposite direction.

3. If a capital outflow is not expected to last but likely to be reversed, it would be inappropriate to desire a real adjustment of the balance of payments, that is, an adjustment of the flow of goods and services to the flow of capital.

REAL ADJUSTMENT VERSUS COMPENSATORY CORRECTION

Analysts of the balance-of-payments situation have long used the dichotomy between adjustment and financing a surplus or deficit. It is analytically more appropriate to distinguish three types of changes in the balance of payments: real adjustments, compensatory corrections, and temporary financing.

Real adjustments reduce or remove an imbalance through changes in relative incomes, prices, and resource allocations. Compensatory corrections reduce or remove the need for real adjustment in the long run, either through changing the current account by means other than the forces of real adjustment or by changing donation accounts and capital accounts. Temporary financing accommodates the excess demand or excess supply in the foreign-exchange market until real adjustment is either accomplished or made unnecessary.

Most serious students of international economics adhere to the classical view that the current account should be made to adjust to the balance on capital account. To attempt the opposite, that is, to correct the flow of capital to match the balance in the flow of goods and services, is usually ineffective or inefficient. An exception to this rule, however, may be recognized with regard to purely speculative capital movements that are likely to reverse their direction in due course. Thus, if we believe that a large part of the present deficit on capital account is only temporary and reversible, then we should not insist on a real adjustment of the balance of payments. It would be wasteful to force a flow of goods and services to match a flow of funds that can be expected to be reversed in the near future.

The implications of these general statements for our analysis of the outflow of U.S. private capital are the following: To the extent that the capital outflow is induced by differences in the marginal productivity of investment here and abroad, we should not interfere with such outflow but should instead facilitate real adjustment of the current balance. To the extent, however, that the capital outflow is motivated by reversible expectations, we should not insist on a real adjustment but should instead promote the reversal of the expectations.

REVERSING THE EXPECTATIONS

We have not been very astute in persuading people here and abroad that their expectations or fears are unfounded. On the contrary, our behavior has been designed to reinforce the two kinds of fears that motivate the outflow of capital, the fear that the dollar may be devalued, and the fear that transfers of funds abroad may be restricted. Let us discuss what we have done to increase these fears and what we might do to reduce them.

The fear of devaluation

1. Instead of freeing all our gold for export; that is, for the repurchase of our dollar liabilities, we have taken only a half measure and have left on our statute books the requirement of a 25-percent gold reserve for Federal Reserve notes. This strengthens widely held expectations to the effect that we are not prepared to use all our gold in the defense of the external value of the dollar.

2. Whenever certain foreign monetary authorities have announced that they would use some of their dollar holdings for purchasing gold from us, we have responded with a frown. Yet, any reluctance or sign of indignation about an outflow of gold strengthens the belief of the people that we consider this as a weakening of our position. If my banker frowned and sighed whenever I cashed a check, I would certainly not wish to keep my deposit with him. We ought to give up our gold not with reluctance and apprehension, but with an air of friendly nonchalance.

3. Our attitude concerning our gold holdings should change completely: We should invite all reluctant holders of dollars to come and buy as much gold as they wish; we should insist that no one hold dollars just to accommodate us; dollars should be held only by those who really prefer interest-bearing dollars to sterile gold.

4. This preference for dollars over gold could be forcefully increased if we accepted the suggestion made in the minority views on the "Annual Report of the Joint Economic Committee," 87th Congress, 2d session, 1962. According to this suggestion, the United States should eliminate its guarantee to purchase "gold from foreigners at $35 an ounce or at any other predetermined price." In the minority view, the "termination of the guarantee to buy at a fixed price would be likely to sharply reduce [gold] speculation and, at the same time, stimulate a return of sizable amounts of gold to the United States." If there is serious doubt that gold can always be sold to governmental and monetary authorities, the speculators' risk of loss from holding gold may be too great and he may convert it into dollars.

5. A more effective policy for reversing expectations concerning the future of the dollar would be the acceptance of a plan which I presented in 1960. It consists in a gradual lowering of the price of gold, say by 1 percent every quarter of a year. I shall refrain from discussing it at this point, because I know that the resistance to it cannot be overcome.

The fear of restrictions

While we have done badly regarding the fears of devaluation, we have done even worse concerning the fears of restrictions. In fact, we have created and promoted such fears.

1. From some semiofficial quarters the possibility of governmental restrictions on the outflow of capital was suggested a few months ago. This was incredibly stupid.

2. We have actually introduced guidelines and challenges which, if they are not regarded as restrictions, are widely considered as the first step toward restrictions.

3. To reverse these fears we ought to tell every businessman that he should use his funds wherever business interests indicate. If we could possibly assure businessmen that there would be neither direct controls or restrictions nor any moral suasion, neither any obligation to make reports on foreign transactions nor any publicity about nonconformance with official directives, we would soon see a flow of funds returning from abroad.

RADICAL CHANGES IN OUR SYSTEM

Again and again in recent years have we heard warnings against radical changes of our monetary and economic system. All sorts of plans have been criticized and rejected on this score. There have been warnings against the complete removal of the gold reserve requirements, against floating and even against a little more flexible exchange rates, against changes in the price of gold, against an international central bank, and even against modest extensions of powers of the International Monetary Fund, etc. I submit that any or all of these changes would be less radical than the change promulgated during the last 2 weeks in the issuance of guidelines by the Federal Reserve Board and the challenges to private business by the Secretary of Commerce. Not since the NRA in 1933 has this country attempted in peacetime to transform the managements of private business into lengthened arms of the Government. By calling on the business community—even if this is confined to 600 business firms—for voluntary cooperation we have taken an enormous step away from our system of free enterprise.

Protestations to the effect that these guidelines and exhortations are not prohibitions or binding regulations reveal a lack of understanding. Some think there is a great difference between outright prohibition of certain transactions under the threat of legal sanctions and mere exhortation against these transactions under the threat of publicity in the case of nonconformance. In actual fact, corporate management is more afraid of a threat of adverse publicity than of a fine of a few thousand dollars. Hence, I submit that the guidelines and the program of voluntary cooperation are in effect restrictions and regulations of private banking and private business. That there was no outcry against this radical change of our system of free enterprise indicates the degree to which our people's belief in fundamental values of our economic system has weakened and the belief in the benefits from a system of public regulation has grown stronger.

My lament for free enterprise will not strike many sympathetic chords. It will probably be regarded as an expression of the nostalgia, if not hysteria, of an old-fashioned libertarian. I am painfully aware of this. But my warnings against our present policy are not merely on these general grounds. They are also on the ground that our policy will be effective only if the adverse expectations about the future of the dollar are reversed—and in this case the interference with business decisions would be superfluous. Indeed, the reversal of expectations would be much more easily achieved if Government did not feel compelled to resort to measures involving moral compulsion.

I conclude that the measures are either not necessary or futile. Their quick repeal would be more helpful than the most punctilious voluntary cooperation would be. For such cooperation cannot last if it becomes too expensive.

CONCLUSION

Where does all this leave me? Although I repeat that most forecasts of balance of payments are worthless, I shall attempt a diagnosis of the present situation.

The deficit of our capital balance includes large amounts of speculative, reversible movements. In my judgment the reversible portion is large enough for us to rely on this correction as one that would make further adjustments of the balance on current account unnecessary.

The reversible flow of capital depends on expectations regarding the future value of the dollar as well as the freedom of transferring dollars back and forth without any restrictions or inhibitions. If favorable expectations could be created on both these scores, I would be quite optimistic about the disappearance of the present dollar glut without resort to policies injurious to our economy or the world economy.

TRIBUTE TO ADM. SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, those who have attended Harvard College have been privileged to study history under Adm. Samuel Eliot Morison. Millions of other people have had the opportunity to learn our history from his many books. Admiral Morison has also served as official historian of the U.S. Navy.

Now Admiral Morison has published another historical work called, "The Oxford History of the American People," which adds another major work to a long and distinguished career as a historian.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on Admiral Morison appearing in the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1965]

MORISON REMAINS THE ADMIRAL WHO RULES THE SEAS OF HISTORY—AFTER 50 YEARS OF WRITING, HE PREPARES TO LAUNCH A STUDY OF AMERICA

(By Harry Gilroy)

BOSTON, March 3.—Samuel Eliot Morison, who has written and lived history for 50 years and has capped it all with 5 years of intensive work on "The Oxford History of the American People," sums it all up with, "I'm proud of being an American."

The 1-volume, 1,150-page work will be published by the Oxford University Press on April 22. The history ranges from sometime between 13000 and 17000 B.C. when a 30-year-old woman was buried near what is now Midland, Tex., to the end of the administration of John F. Kennedy.

"I absorbed history from birth," Mr. Morison said last night. A hint of a smile brightened his serious face just as a blue-and-white polka-dot bow tie lightened his dark gray suit. He sat in a book-lined room at his home at 44 Brimmer Street, a red-brick house on a street that still has red brick sidewalks.

The historian was born there in 1887. Charles W. Eliot, who became president of Harvard University, was a cousin. Harrison Gray Otis, a leader of the Federalist Party, was an ancestor.

When Mr. Morison was in his junior year at Harvard he disclosed to Prof. Alfred Bushnell Hart that the Otis papers were in the family wine cellar; he was immediately put to work on what became his first book.

THE MANTLE OF CHANNING

He won his doctorate with the two-volume work, and Prof. Edward Channing then confided that he was tired of teaching colonial history. Mr. Morison recalled that the professor had said, "Now Sammy if you keep out of jail and not run around with too many radicals and socialites, we'll get you into Harvard and you can take over colonial history." And that's what happened.

At this point, Mr. Morison's recital was interrupted.

"Admiral, you give the wrong impression," expostulated his wife, a lovely blonde woman in a cantaloupe-colored dress. She always uses his naval title. His connection with the Navy began when he entered as a lieutenant commander in World War II, in which he saw action, and continued throughout the writing of the 15-volume "History of U.S. Naval Operations in World War II."

"He is a Renaissance man," she said. "He is a wonderful sailor. He has gone fox hunting. He has been socially gay. He has gone to balls, loved music, lived in the old way that no longer exists. When he writes history, it is with knowledge of what things are really like on all levels and in all kinds of things."

Mr. Morison smiled over his wife's comments and added:

"I have no imagination. I can't write about a battlefield until I have been over it nor about sea warfare unless I have taken part in it."

IN THE WAKE OF COLUMBUS

That is what led Professor Morison from Harvard in 1938 on a voyage to duplicate Columbus' and to the book "Admiral of the Ocean Sea: a Life of Christopher Columbus." Professor Morrison received a Pulitzer Prize for the work.

"Lots of people still believe the myth that Columbus made his first voyage to prove the world was round. I wrote that book to correct such myths and to show what great things Columbus accomplished on all his voyages."

The historian has rendered services to or has known leading figures in the administrations of every President since Woodrow Wilson. President Johnson has given him the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Mr. Morison said that his new book deals not only with American leaders and great issues but also with ordinary American people.

He added that when he thought over the sweep of history, "I feel very proud of the American people."

He mentioned that he had been 3 years at Oxford University and was very happy there.

"But I never dreamed of becoming British as T. S. Eliot and Henry James did," he said. "I am an American and I am proud of being an American."

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Greek Independence Day has a special meaning for Americans. When Greek patriots rose against their oppressors 144 years ago, they became the first European people to carry on the American movement for independence. Americans of that day could not help but make the Greek cause their own. Even though the common historical experience of both our countries goes back a scant century and a half, the ideals and principles which form the basis of our political and social institutions and which gave impetus to our desire for freedom can be traced through the centuries to the inception of democracy in the Greek city states.

At the time of the revolution, American leaders expressed their sympathy for the Greek cause. Some volunteered to serve with the sorely outnumbered Greek patriots and others organized efforts to send at least symbolic aid to the Greeks. The struggle for independence was long and bitter. The Greeks, however, saw their tenacity crowned with success and after many centuries of foreign rule freedom was gained by the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829, followed by the London protocol of 1830. During the next century the Greeks devoted themselves to encompassing all persons of Greek heritage within their national boundaries and to establishing a stable government.

With the beginning of World War II they again showed fierce devotion to freedom and independence by repelling the Italian invasion of 1940 and by stubbornly resisting the German invasion of 1941. The end of World War II, however, brought no respite to the Greeks, who faced a new and ominous threat within their boundaries in the form of armed Communist guerrilla bands seeking to overthrow the Government. Although the struggle against the guerrillas was long and delayed economic reconstruction by several years, it, too, was crowned with success.

Since that time we have been gratified to see the establishment of a strong, stable Government in Greece and to observe the development of a pulsing, growing economy. During my visit to Greece in 1962, I was impressed not only by the extraordinary beauty of the country with its many historical and cultural monuments, but especially by the warm friendliness and progressive spirit of the people. I am proud of the many significant and lasting contributions that they and their American descendants have made to the heritage of Massachusetts and our Nation. It is, indeed, a great pleasure for me to extend my greeting to the people of Greece and to their many friends and relatives in the United States on this celebration of their independence.

BANKING VERSUS THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Miami Herald of March 16 entitled, "Unscramble a $7-Billion Omlet."

Mr. President, this editorial refers to the decision of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York in the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. case decided on March 11, 1965. This opinion was the outgrowth of two decisions by the Supreme Court; *U.S.* v. *Philadelphia National Bank*, 374 U.S. 321 (XXXX) and *U.S.* v. *First National Bank & Trust Co. of Lexington*, 376 U.S. (XXXXXXXXX). In the Philadelphia and Lexington cases the Supreme Court, for the first time in its history, held that bank mergers were subject to section 7 of the Clayton Act and section 1 of the Sherman Act. The Philadelphia case held that the proposed merger would violate both section 7 of the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act. The Lexington case held that the merger there violated the Sherman Act. The Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. case held that its merger violated section 1 of the Sherman Act and section 7 of the Clayton Act.

These decisions were reached although the responsible Government agencies which considered the applications for mergers had held, after considering all the factors involved including both banking factors and competitive factors, that the mergers were affirmatively in the public interest. In addition, in the New York case the New York State banking superintendent of banks had also approved the merger.

I said at the time the Philadelphia decision was announced that it was "one of the most incredible cases of judicial legislation which the Court has handed down." I also said that I was shocked both at the result and the Court's casual disregard for congressional intent and purpose. I pointed out that Congressman CELLER, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, had testified in favor of the Bank Merger Act, though with stronger provisions, because bank mergers were not covered by section 7 of the Clayton Act. Five representatives from the Justice Department also testified to this fact—Attorney General Brownell in 1957, Deputy Attorney General Walsh in 1959, Judge Barnes in 1956, Judge Hanson in 1957 and the Honorable Robert A. Bicks in 1960. In addition, Congressman CELLER induced the House to pass an amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act which would have made it apply to bank mergers, but this failed in the Senate. Finally, an amendment was proposed by Senator O'Mahoney to the Bank Merger Act in 1959 which would have imposed the stricter standards of the Clayton Act, but this was defeated by a vote of 29 yeas and 55 nays. In its report the committee intended to leave no doubt that section 7 of the Clayton Act should not apply. It said:

> Since there was widespread agreement that some mergers were in the public interest and should be approved, even though they might result in a substantial lessening of competition, the committee concluded that the strict rule of the 1950 amendment of section 7 of the Clayton Act was inappropriate to the field of banking * * *.
>
> The committee, therefore, concluded that it was preferable to handle bank mergers under rules specially designed for the banking industry.

The decision in the Philadelphia case was entirely unexpected. Mr. Justice Harlan condemned it by saying:

> I suspect that no one will be more surprised than the Government to find that the Clayton Act has carried the day for its case in this Court.

He went on—

> The result is, of course, that the Bank Merger Act is almost completely nullified; its enactment turns out to have been an exorbitant waste of congressional time and energy.
>
> This frustration of a manifest congressional design is, in my view, a most unwarranted intrusion upon the legislative domain.

In the Lexington case Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent criticized the application of the Sherman Act—made necessary because the Government had not thought that the Clayton Act would apply when it filed its complaint—on the ground that, "The truth is, of course, that this is, if

anything, a Clayton Act case masquerading in the garb of the Sherman Act."

At the time of the Philadelphia decision I said that it was too early to tell just what the decision means. It now seems clear that at least it will mean an effort by the Department of Justice and the courts, carried out with the threat of contempt fines and the appointment of masters in chicanery, to split the merged bank into two different banks. What with the changes that have gone on and the growth that has occurred since the merger, they will clearly not be the same two banks they were originally. How the depositors, borrowers, and other customers, and how the officers, employees, and stockholders will feel toward these new banks we do not know. I think we are now beginning, however, to see the unfortunate results of ill-considered efforts by the Supreme Court to supersede the Congress as the legislative body of the United States.

The editorial from the Miami Herald is a clear and convincing picture of the dangers that lie before us in this field.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Honorable K. A. Randall, Director of FDIC in which he endorses the views of Mr. Justice Harlan concerning the meaning and effect of the Bank Merger Act and its construction by the courts.

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

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 16, 1965]

UNSCRAMBLE A $7 BILLION OMELET?

A slight rash of bank mergers around the country in 1961 has been followed by Justice Department action to undo what many thought logical and lawful at the time.

The most spectacular of these antitrust suits involves Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. of New York, a $7 billion institution. Whether the Federal Government is right or wrong, the timing of the matter gives pause. How do you unscramble these eggs after 4 years?

Under a Federal court ruling which warned of "a clear and imminent threat that a handful of banks are likely to sew the market up tight," the New York concern must be returned to the two-bank status which obtained in 1961.

No more intricate and costly divestiture could be imagined.

A bank is essentially a service industry. If it is sizable, it is involved every day in thousands of transactions embracing tens of thousands of persons in one manner or another. Manufacturers Hanover, for example, has 136 branches throughout New York City. The task of pulling all of this apart and making two out of one would be staggering.

Even more disturbing is the strange history of the New York case.

When Manufacturers and Hanover came together in 1961 the merger had the explicit blessing of the Federal Reserve Board. The Antitrust Division of the Justice Department waited until the day of the actual merger, which took many months to arrange, before it attacked what one arm of Government already had applauded and which the court has acknowledged is desirable though illegal.

If the law is pursued relentlessly in an industry which has known many mergers over the years the result could be banking chaos.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, March 25, 1965.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This note is for your information following my discussions with your chief of staff, Mr. Matthew Hale, relating to an article in the American Banker, March 23.

* * * * *

Without any qualification, I believe that the Bank Merger Act of 1960 is the finest, clearest statement of policy in regard to mergers and competition the bank regulatory agencies have ever had. Problems arose when the Philadelphia-Girard case was superimposed upon the Bank Merger Act standards.

The legislative history, the terms of the act, and your statements on the floor of the Senate should leave no doubt in anyone's mind that section 7 of the Clayton Act was not to be used in bank merger cases. Mr. Justice Harlan, in his dissent, clarified this position, and I would hope that someday this magnificent dissent could find its way to the foreground of interpretation in this area of bank supervision.

A further problem relating to the Philadelphia-Girard case is the definition of "a line of commerce." As you know the Justice Department allows only commercial banking to be measured as a competitive factor under their regulations yet, from the legislative history, the bank supervisory agencies are required, as they should be, to look at the competitive effects of other financial intermediaries.

Again, Senator, may I state that I support your philosophy wholeheartedly.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

K. A. RANDALL,
Director.

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal for March 24, 1965, contained an editorial entitled "A Question of Perversion"; the Greensboro Daily News for March 23, 1965, carried an editorial entitled "Special Laws and Blanket Indictments"; and the Washington Evening Star for March 24, 1965, carried an article, by Richard Wilson, entitled "Question Lingers on Voting [redacted]" These editorials and this article made some sound observations concerning the pending Federal voting rights bill, and merit the thoughtful consideration of all men who revere the Constitution of the United States, and wish to preserve constitutional government in this country. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials and this article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 24, 1965]

A QUESTION OF PERVERSION

When the Attorney General began his explanation and defense of the proposed Federal voting bill he adopted a fascinating line of reasoning that deserves more attention than it seems to be getting.

Appearing before a Senate judiciary subcommittee, Mr. Katzenbach made no claim that the Constitution gives to the Federal Government the authority to set voting qualifications in all the several States, nor did he cite any Supreme Court opinions to suggest that the Federal Government has this power.

He hardly could have. For the very first article of the Constitution—reaffirmed by the 17th amendment—lays down only one qualification which the National Government may insist upon—namely, that all voters qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of any State legislature must be qualified also to vote in any national election.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution adds one other, and a very important one. It is that no State may take away the voting rights of any citizen "on account of" his race or color. And the 24th amendment bars poll taxes as a requirement for voting.

In short, then, the Constitution says this: No State may set higher qualifications for voting in Federal elections than in State ones, that no poll taxes shall be levied, and that every citizen must be treated equally by the voting laws of each State. Within that framework, each State is free to establish its own qualifications as to age, length of residency, literacy, and the like.

This view has been consistently affirmed by the Supreme Court. Only 8 years ago, in a case specifically involving a literacy test in North Carolina, the Court repeated that "the States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised." The limitation on that power, in the Court's words, is that they cannot authorize "the discrimination which the Constitution condemns."

So to justify a Federal law to override State voting requirements and permit the Federal Government to eliminate literacy requirements entirely in some States, Mr. Katzenbach had to adopt the line of reasoning that the abuse of a principle condemns the whole principle.

That is, he argues that the Federal Government, under color of the 15th amendment, has the authority to override the constitutional right of some States because literacy tests "have been perverted to test not literacy, not ability, not understanding—but race." And this is sufficient reason for the Federal Government to eliminate them entirely wherever such perversion has taken place.

This argument, please note, is quite different from an argument for a Federal law requiring that all literacy tests be fair and equitable and that Federal authorities be authorized, wherever necessary, to see that it is so.

The fact that literacy tests can be fair, and equitable, in fact, is conceded; the literacy test of New York State will be left untouched, as will those in a number of other States. But the distinction is not made on an examination of the individual merits, judicially measured, of such tests. The merits or demerits would be measured, under this law, by how many people vote.

On Mr. Katzenbach's line of reasoning the Congress could have abolished poll taxes—surely a thing susceptible to abuse—by simple statute instead of, as was properly done, by constitutional amendments.

Indeed, on this line of reasoning the fact that police powers are sometimes abused by local policemen—and they certainly are—would become an argument not for halting the abuse but for eliminating the local police powers.

For our own part, we have no reason to doubt that in some places the constitutional principle under which each State sets its own voting requirement has been perverted to deny some people the voting rights they are entitled to. And we agree that this is a

strong argument for national action to remedy those abuses, wherever occurring.

But if that is also an argument for altering the Constitution in unconstitutional fashion, then what the Attorney General of the United States is saying is that one perversion justifies another.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Mar. 23, 1965]

SPECIAL LAWS AND BLANKET INDICTMENTS

In the present tense situation in Alabama Federal officials—and indeed everyone connected with the civil rights controversy—should check carefully on facts and figures before sounding off in public.

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach failed to do this in remarks made before a House committee last Friday. The substance of his testimony was sound—much of the civil rights story in the South had been one of "intimidation, discouragement and delay" in the struggle to win full citizenship rights for Negroes.

But the Attorney General barked up the wrong tree when he dragged 34 eastern North Carolina counties into the picture and linked them with Alabama. The reference was to the projected abolition of literacy tests in counties where less than 50 percent of eligible citizens turned out to vote—and they included Aroostook County in Maine as well as most of four Southern States, parts of Alaska and Arizona and 34 counties in North Carolina.

"They may have had a snowstorm in Aroostook County," the Attorney General told the committee, "but they didn't have a snowstorm in 34 counties of North Carolina, and they didn't have a snowstorm in Mississippi."

No, there was no snowstorm down here last November. But as for North Carolina neither was there specific "intimidation, discouragement or delay" in registration or voting for Negro citizens. The only protests about registration delays in North Carolina in recent years have been confined to one county, Halifax—and that situation has now been cleared.

Let it be understood by Mr. Katzenbach and others, including President Johnson and Rev. Martin Luther King, that North Carolina cannot be tarred with the brush of Alabama or Mississippi. Negro citizens have had the right to register to vote here just as other citizens have. They have been subjected to the same kind of literacy tests which apply for all other would-be voters—except in several very rare situations in Halifax County.

To equate conditions in North Carolina with those in Dallas County simply because less than 50 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls last November is presumptuous and inaccurate. It indicts the thinking behind the President's new Federal voting legislation.

There are far, far more reasons than racial discrimination behind some of the voting apathy in North Carolina, Mississippi or New York. As we noted the other day, the Guilford County Elections Board has tried to cooperate in getting more registrants on the books; a study of its recent efforts reveals that even voters signed up by an intensive campaign have stayed away from the general election in droves.

It is grossly unfair to infer that simply because 50 percent of the eligible voters failed to go to the polls, racial discrimination is the reason.

The more we study the President's Federal voting legislation, the more we are convinced that the 50-percent figure is ill advised. Indeed, the whole idea of setting up special laws to cover certain statistical situations may not work fairly. The Federal Government's duty is to see that all citizens are allowed to register and vote if they desire to do so. It is not to create special rules for some citizens which do not apply to all citizens. And that quite clearly would be done if literacy tests and other voter qualifications are abolished in certain areas but allowed to flourish in others.

Basic constitutional principles are involved on both sides of this controversy over suffrage rights. One principle ought not to receive higher priority than another, closer home, and the Attorney General should watch his blanket indictments based on fuzzy statistics.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 24, 1965]

QUESTION LINGERS ON VOTING BILL

(By Richard Wilson)

The question that the advocates of the new voting rights bill have as yet failed to answer adequately is this: Why should literacy tests as a qualification for voting be perfectly all right in 45 of the 50 States but invalid in the other 5?

If a voter in Alabama who cannot read or write is qualified to vote in a Federal or any other election why should not an illiterate New Yorker have the same right? The right to vote certainly has no connection with the number of people who vote, and it is manifestly unjust to bar an illiterate from voting in a State where less than 50 percent of the qualified voters cast their ballots, but to permit him to vote in a State where more than 50 percent of the voters go to the polls.

This, nevertheless, would be the effect in 606 counties in 10 States of the passage of the voter rights bill sent to Congress by President Johnson.

The only justification offered for this anomaly is that it is the only way to force election officials in those 10 States to register Negroes to vote. Otherwise, they will enforce prohibitive regulations that prevent Negroes from voting, but not enforce the same regulations on whites who could not meet the qualifications.

This is another example of the devious legislative tactics in the Johnson administration to achieve results by legal circumlocution. Another outstanding example is the aid to education bill that attempts to get around the church-state issue.

From the President's recent statements it can be concluded that what he really desires is the removal of virtually all restrictions on voting for persons 18 years old, and over, if they are sane, and in spite of the fact that the Supreme Court would have to reverse itself in finding that the imposition of reasonable qualifications is valid.

It must be admitted that literacy tests as a qualification for voting are honored in the breach in the North. Thirty States have no such requirements. States that do have literacy requirements often do not enforce them, or the enforcement is so cursory as to be meaningless.

New York requires proof of an eighth grade education or demonstration of the ability to read as a requirement for voters. This excludes a great many people, including recently arrived Pureto Ricans, from voting and is being challenged in the courts. Previous Federal legislation proposals would have required a sixth grade education as proof of literacy.

Residency requirements are universal. In short, people are not born in this country with an inherent right to vote at any time or any place. This is a right for which they must qualify by tests that vary from State to State, and which was affirmed by a 1959 Supreme Court decision. The layman would think that the Constitution is quite clear on this point in its 1st article and in the 17th amendment, to say nothing of the 1959 decision of the Supreme Court.

Furthermore, the Johnson voting rights bill recognizes this principle by providing that a voter shall be stricken from the rolls if he fails to vote at least once in 3 consecutive years. Thus the Federal law would impose restrictions Congress regards as reasonable while outlawing other restrictions imposed by the States.

Why is not the issue confronted squarely? Why is Congress not asked to abolish literacy requirements in all States altogether?

The answer to that is clear. It is because literacy requirements have validity both in reason and in law. It makes sense that a voter should have at least an elementary ability to read and write the language of the country in which he resides. It makes sense that States should have the power to set reasonable minimum standards for voters, and the proposed law recognizes that by itself setting some standards. It hardly needs to be argued, also, that a Federal law should apply equally to the citizens of all States.

The strange, awkward, and unequal nature of this new legislation shows how wrong it is to try to legislate on such complicated matters in an atmosphere of violence-provoking public demonstrations.

The Johnson administration was rushed into the presentation of a law that has so many obvious flaws that it can immediately be challenged in the courts. Elaborate and tricky formulas provide no answer for a more basic question: Why in a nation with compulsory, universal public education are so many people, Negro and white, illiterate? And why should there be a premium on illiteracy in some States and not in others?

MENTAL ILLNESS AND INSTABILITY—ADDRESS BY LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently the Honorable Luther W. Youngdahl, judge of the District Court for the District of Columbia, addressed the American Association of School Administrators, at Atlantic City, N.J. In his speech, he outlined the basic necessity for a concerted attack on the problems of mental illness and instability in some 48 million young Americans. Judge Youngdahl, when he was Governor of the State of Minnesota, first turned the attention of our State to the problems of mental health, a concern and emphasis followed in and amplified by the present fine and able Governor of the State of Minnesota, Karl F. Rolvaag.

His concern parallels that of our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, in providing full utilization of Federal programs to combat mental illness and retardation. I ask unanimous consent that Judge Youngdahl's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW FRONTIERS IN MENTAL HEALTH: DEVELOPING THE POTENTIAL OF OUR YOUTH

(An address by Judge Luther W. Youngdahl, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, to the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J., February 17, 1965)

While looking through one of the recent issues of your bulletin, the School Administrator, I came across some striking examples of the foresightedness of your association. In 1891, for example, it appeared that your predecessors passed a resolution limiting speakers to 5 minutes. At a later meeting it was ruled that "all speakers discussing a paper shall speak without a manuscript."

I should like to be exempted from both these rulings today in order that that I may speak to you about a subject very close to my

heart—the role of mental health in developing the potential of our Nation's most precious natural resource: our youth.

My interest in mental health dates back to more than 40 years ago when I was assistant city attorney of Minneapolis. It seemed to me then that a large number of cases involved some kind of emotional disturbance. When I became Governor of Minnesota in 1947, it was only natural that one of my major concerns should be mental health. In the intervening years, more than 28 of which have been on the bench, I have seen many tragic cases, but most tragic by far have been those involving young people.

You, too, have had a long-standing interest in our youth. As early as 1894, your predecessors recommended that the States enact laws permitting the introduction of kindergartens into the public school system. There have also been resolutions endorsing vocational education and urging that schools discourage children from forming the habit of smoking cigarettes. I was particularly interested in a proposal made in 1908 urging that large cities set up special ungraded classes to instruct children of immigrants unable to speak English. This was accompanied by a proposal for evening school to teach the English language to adult immigrants. These early resolutions of the American Association of School Administrators bear a striking resemblance to some of the President's recent proposals for our educational system that come in response to a long-standing need.

The President's program is designed to bring the full benefits of education to our youth. I was particularly interested in the proposals for preschool programs to overcome the effects of cultural impoverishment, and for special educational resource centers. These centers would, among other things, provide services for physically and mentally handicapped children. This program offers us a great opportunity to deal constructively with two major impediments to the learning process—cultural deprivation and emotional instability. It also offers a vehicle for closer cooperation between mental health and the schools.

As the educational leaders of America, you have been expected to overcome many obstacles, and it must have often seemed that you were doing it singlehandedly. The responsibility for bringing the benefits of a universal, free public education to 48 million young Americans is no small matter. Moreover, the importance of the task steadily increases as our society becomes one in which there is little room for the unskilled and uneducated.

For years—indeed throughout the history of our country—the schools have stood alone in facing the problem of how to educate the seemingly ineducable. You have been confronted with children who are incapable, antagonistic, or, at best, indifferent toward learning. Your profession and your own instincts demand that you design an educational system fitted to the abilities, interests, and needs of every child. Thus you must find a way to help the social misfits, the physically and emotionally handicapped, and the culturally deprived, while at the same time meeting the needs of the academically able.

It is not an easy dilemma; but it is one that thousands of men and women devoted to the field of mental health are trying to help you solve. This challenge of bringing young people to their fullest intellectual and emotional potential has marshaled the forces of education and mental health into a new partnership. Together, you stand at the edge of the greatest frontier man has ever faced—the unexplored reaches of the human mind.

Most people have accepted without much questioning the widely prevalent idea that there is a stigma attached to mental illness; that nothing can be done about it; and that the unhappy victims must be put away in some institution to spend the rest of their days.

These ridiculed, abused, and maligned members of our social family cannot speak for themselves. They are made mute by sickness, guarded walls, and the loss of their civil rights. Their heartbroken families are rendered equally silent by the cruel stigma which false social attitudes attach to the mentally ill. Casualties of the spirit, voiceless and powerless, their very personalities, yes, their very lives are completely dependent on the concern, wisdom, and compassion of those of us who are more fortunate.

Almost two decades ago, while Governor of Minnesota, I secured the passage of legislation establishing a bill of rights for the mentally ill. The first sentence in this bill of rights stated that mental illness is a disease to which there should be no shame or stigma attached. We have been slow to change our thinking in this area of human relationship. But the time has come when a vast majority of the mentally ill need no longer be put away in an institution—out of sight, out of mind.

One of the first efforts at exploration is being made through a vast new national mental health program to help men reach their maximum potential with minds free from emotional disturbance. In this unprecedented effort, every possible community resource will be used to improve the mental health of our citizens. The community mental health program, as it is called, has two major objectives: First, to treat mental illness in the community rather than in distant State hospitals; second, to prevent mental illness by finding and eradicating its causes.

A test was given in an institution for the mentally ill to determine whether the sick individual was ready for release. The patient was placed beside a tap of running water. A large empty tub was placed beneath the tap. An empty pail was placed beside the tub and the patient was asked to bail out the water. If he started to bail out the water without first turning off the tap, the source of supply, it was concluded that he did not have sufficient judgment and discretion to justify his release from the institution. But if he first turned off the tap, the source of supply, and then started to bail out the water, it was determined that he had sufficient judgment and discretion to warrant his release from the hospital. I am sure you can quickly draw the analogy that we have not been paying enough attention to prevention in eradicating the causes of mental illness. You will observe that the real thrust of this new program is the emphasis on prevention.

One-fourth of all Americans are in the Nation's classrooms. Thus the schools are in a unique position to detect children who, left unaided, may develop serious learning problems and mental illness. Of all community resources, the schools are perhaps the most vital factor in insuring the success of this program. In return, they will have much to gain from its successful operation.

Let me further describe this effort which Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has termed "one of the boldest programs in the field of mental health in the history of the world," by briefly tracing its historical development.

In the 1840's Dorothea Lynde Dix's crusade against the misery of the mentally ill led to the establishment of a State hospital system. Over the years, rising numbers of patients caused these institutions to become deplorably overcrowded. In 1908, Clifford Beers, a former mental patient, criticized squalid conditions in State mental hospitals. His book, "A Mind That Found Itself," heralded the beginning of an organized citizen's mental hygiene movement.

During World War II, when one in eight young men were rejected for military service because of emotional instability, the need for better psychiatric treatment in this country became shockingly apparent. As a result, Congress enacted legislation in 1946 authorizing the establishment of the National Institute of Mental Health in Bethesda, Md. This act brought to fruition the idea of Federal aid advanced by Dorothea Dix a century earlier. xxxxxxx

In 1949, the new National Institute of Mental Health became the focus for the Federal Government's program supporting research into the causes of mental illness, training of needed mental health personnel, and aid to the States in developing mental health services in the community. The introduction of tranquilizing drugs in the mid-1950's gave tremendous momentum to the community psychiatry movement by making it possible to treat large numbers of hospitalized patients and to discharge many others.

Several more years of planning ways to provide adequate services to the mentally ill in the community culminated in February 1963 with President Kennedy's message in behalf of mental health. He told Congress, "We need a new type of health facility, one which will return mental health care to the mainstream of American medicine, and at the same time upgrade mental health services." Construction of this new type of facility—the community mental health center—became possible in October 1963, with passage of the Community Mental Health Centers Act. This legislation authorized Federal matching funds for use by the States to construct comprehensive community mental health centers.

This new national approach involves much more than the construction of a network of at least 500 mental health centers by 1970. It involves a shift in orientation to include both treatment and prevention of mental illness.

A center will provide a full range of services—from diagnosis and treatment to rehabilitation—at the time of the patient's need, and near his home. In many communities this will mean coordinating existing services and facilities to allow patients to move from one to another without administrative hinderance.

In addition, and equally important, a center will provide consultative services to individuals and agencies who daily deal with the public. Clergymen, general practitioners, pediatricians, judges, police officers, and teachers will be assisted in recognizing the warning signs of emotional disturbance and in knowing how to find help. As society's gatekeepers they will be able to unite in an integrated effort toward promoting better mental health.

The success of this great undertaking will depend upon the vigorous support of States and communities, professional and voluntary groups, and individual citizens. Already planning groups comprised of nongovernment professional people, including educators and other school representatives, are involved in developing State plans.

Like all great social movements, this one will require the support of thousands of individuals—persons like yourselves who have such a vital role in community affairs. It is imperative that the entire community, and particularly the schools, join in this endeavor. Our hopes for eventually bringing men to their fullest intellectual and emotional potential are closely tied to the success of this program.

As the mental health centers program evolves, the world unfortunately is not standing still. Emotional problems and their consequences continue to beset society, and the schools have their share.

Recent research discoveries, however, have given us a better awareness of how to prevent the worst effects of two factors that hamper

and often stagnate the learning process in schoolchildren—stress and cultural deprivation.

Stress, of course, is something with which you are all too familiar. You are expected to run our schools while at the same time mediating and dealing constructively with the demands of parents, teachers, legislators, budget experts, newspaper editors, special interest groups, school boards, and the community at large.

The child often lacks this kind of "coping strength" and cannot acquire knowledge when preoccupied with even minor stresses which he has not yet learned to handle. When a teacher notices that a pupil cannot learn, gets along poorly with other children, is restless, and has repeated physical illnesses, she may be witnessing early symptoms of emotional disturbance. The teacher who can recognize these symptoms, which often differ very little from normal behavior, has a unique opportunity to prevent school misbehavior and learning failure. The symptoms may be caused by difficulties between the child's parents which the child can only sense. Or the trouble may stem from more visible crises such as the birth of a sibling or a death in the family. Research studies have identified certain crisis periods that every child encounters. These include entry into school, the so-called third-grade crisis when classroom emphasis shifts from preparation for achieving to achieving, the transition between junior high school and high schools, and the transition between high school and college.

Mental health experts have found that by giving special help and understanding to the child during crisis periods, the teacher can exert a tremendous influence in helping him over these emotional hurdles. At the same time, the teacher can help the child build immunity to stress so he can face future crises with even greater strength.

The many children who have not learned how to handle stress help form the basis for some disheartening statistics. It has been estimated that 1 out of every 10 children in public schools in the United States is emotionally disturbed. About 250,000 of these 4 million disturbed children are seen in mental health and child guidance clinics each year. Only a third of these children, however, actually receive treatment. The rest are merely diagnosed or evaluated for other agencies. Looking ahead, we have this grim prospect: Although the total number of patients in mental hospitals is expected to drop by 1970, the number of patients in the 10-to-24 age group will increase.

Even more distressing to me, however, is the fact that well over half a million young people are brought before the courts each year as juvenile delinquents. Last year, while the total number of children in the 10-to-17 age group rose by 3 percent, the number of juvenile delinquency cases in the same age group rose by 10 percent.

These are the children who do not succeed in school, who are handicapped in earning a living, and who try to restore their self-confidence through antisocial behavior. These are the children whose failure in school so undermines their self-esteem that they often fall an even easier prey to emotional illness.

The schools, through strengthened mental health programs, are our best hope for reversing these trends which point toward even more widespread waste of our youth. In addition to helping children past crisis points, the schools can play a vital role in preventing emotional problems by screening and identifying stress-vulnerable children. An encouraging experiment in this type of primary prevention has been conducted in several schools in Pennsylvania. Tests were administered to children of preschool age to determine the degree of success they were likely to have in their first year of school. The parents of children who were regarded as probable failures were advised to postpone enrollment of their children until 6 months to a year after the regular enrollment age. Most parents who kept their children back when advised to do so found that the children were essentially successful when they did start school. Parents who refused to follow the advice to hold their children back were distressed to find that nearly all these children fulfilled the prediction of school difficulty and failure.

Another factor that has come to be recognized as having a tremendous effect on the development of cognitive capacities, as you know, is the child's early experience with language. I mentioned earlier the association's resolution passed in 1908 to help foreign immigrants learn our language. Today we have a large group of our own citizens who, although they have lived in this country for several generations, have been separated by economic and cultural differences from the mainstream of society. They live in a world of want and deprivation. When their children reach school age, we find that, like the immigrants at the turn of the century, they do not even speak the same language that is used by their teachers and schoolmates in our middle-class-oriented schools. They can hardly be expected to understand even a moderately complex English sentence when they have never before heard one. They are behind before they begin; by third grade they are hopelessly lost; by sixth grade many of them are dropouts; by their early teens they have forsaken society just as society had originally forsaken them.

We have only recently reached that stage of enlightenment at which we would admit that it is not inherent biological defects which cause these children to be lower in intelligence according to arbitrary IQ measurements. It is their surroundings that suffocate them. While they may have been created equal, their quality of opportunity exists in name only.

The schools are now being called upon to play a larger part in breaking the vicious circle of poverty, lack of education, low job skills, and continuing poverty. Their help is needed in counteracting some of the worst effects of cultural deprivation so that the intellectual capacities of these children can grow.

As you know, much concern is currently focused on enrichment programs for culturally deprived children in their early years. Experts on child development have found that by the age of three, many mind and behavior patterns have crystallized. Thus, increasing attention is being given to nursery school programs designed to help children overcome the worst handicaps of their impoverished environment.

We await implementation by Congress of the President's proposed education program, with its exciting implications for strengthening our schools.

However, the national mental health program, already initiated by the Congress, promises to make available important new resources to schools to help them meet their broad new challenge.

The task ahead is great.

Although it is likely that no society has ever made the most of the potential of all its members, our world today puts new demands on us. We must do better than others have done. Although our schools cannot solve all problems, they are crucial to finding any solutions. As your association marks its hundredth year of service to our country, I am confident that you who are present here will play an important role in finding those solutions. And now, more than ever before, you do not stand alone.

Just before I left the governorship of Minnesota in 1951 to accept a position on the Federal bench in Washington, the mentally ill patients of the hospital at Hastings, Minn., gave me a farewell party on the hospital grounds. One of their number was selected to present me with a certificate of appreciation for my work in the area of mental illness. After a recitation of some of the recent accomplishments, the certificate closed with a quotation from Edwin Markham, as follows:

"There is a destiny that makes us brothers.
None goes his way alone.
All that we put into the lives of others
Come back into our own."

So it is with you in your great calling in life—all that you have been putting into the lives of these precious youngsters and your continuing dedication in their behalf will come back into your own lives in rich measure.

We have been worshipping the gods of science and material advancement until we now see ourselves trapped by the monstrous weapons we have devised. Having learned the art of war, we must now learn the art of peace. Having created the mystery of atomic fission, we must accept the golden rule and the Sermon on the Mount.

We stand at the threshold of a great and stimulating future. The significant issue before us is the dignity of the human personality and reverence for life. We Americans are faced with a challenge such as we have never faced before—it is a challenge not of destroying, but of building—a challenge to explore not yesterday's wilderness, but today's plateau of human welfare and dignity. The frontiers of yesterday are closed. The pioneering of the wilderness and of geographical frontiers is over for us. But a new frontier awaits—a frontier whose boundaries are limited only by our imagination and good will. The frontier is waiting for us in the words of Kipling:

"There's no sense in going further,
'Tis the end of civilization,
So they said and I believed it,
Till a voice as loud as thunder
Rang interminable changes on one everlasting whisper,
Day and night repeated,
Something hidden, go and find it,
Go and look beyond the ranges,
Something lost beyond the ranges,
Lost and waiting for you. Go!"

THE GOOD WORK OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the so-called regulatory commissions occupy one of the most difficult and dangerous points in Government. If they try to protect the public interest, they are frequently attacked, both openly and quietly, by the interests they are supposedly regulating. On the other hand, the members of the public whom they are trying to protect are often ignorant of the efforts of the regulatory body in their behalf, and are so absorbed in their personal activities and problems that they seldom back up their defenders. In the meantime, the special-interest groups keep trying to detach and win over the erstwhile defenders of the public.

The all-too-common result is that the concentrated private interests are able to conquer the diffused public interest.

The Federal Power Commission is at the very focal point of this quiet, but immensely important struggle. In recent years, I have admired the fairness and public spirit of this Commission, under the chairmanship of Joseph C. Swidler, who has been ably supported by

Charles R. Ross and David S. Black. I have prepared a summary of the recent work of the Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that this statement and an accompanying table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE RECENT WORK OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

In the last 3½ years the Commission has worked earnestly to improve its performance and to speed the dispatch of its workload. Although much still remains to be done, a great deal has been accomplished. Progress can be reported in the following important areas:

(a) Administrative reform: Beginning in the fall of 1961, the Commission moved swiftly to reorganize its staff to emphasize responsibility for moving cases along. It streamlined its hearing procedures, eliminated lengthy field investigations and made extensive use of settlements rather than prolonged litigation to dispose of cases. Bureau chiefs were encouraged to raise the quality of their staffs and to make the most effective possible use of available manpower. Most impartial observers of the Commission agree that the agency is now alert and responsive and dispatching its workload with reasonable promptness.

(b) Natural gas regulation: In the past 3 years the Commission has completely cleared up the enormous backlog of pipeline rate cases, which involved a cumulative total of $1.6 billion of rates collected subject to refund. In the process the Commission has ordered refunds of $550 million. In addition the city gate prices of natural gas throughout the country has been reduced by a net annual amount of $125 million. Hundreds of producer cases have also been settled. These settlements have increased the total of refunds to over $650 million. The foregoing refunds and rate reductions are by far the largest which any regulatory agency has ordered in the history of regulation.

The disposition of the pipeline rate cases has not only benefited consumers but the pipelines as well. While the refunds were large, the rate levels which the Commission approved permitted the pipelines to meet all of their costs and earn about 6½ percent on their total investment and 10 percent or more on the equity of most pipelines. Even more important, the decisions removed the cloud of uncertainty which threatened the financial standing of many pipelines. In 1961 the amount of rates collected subject to refund had reached such staggering totals that many pipeline companies could not be certain that they were in solvent condition, or whether they were paying dividends from earnings or capital. None was in position to provide investors with firm financial statements. This situation is a thing of the past.

The Commission has also speeded up the pace of its pipeline certificate work. In fiscal 1964 the Commission issued certificates for $748 million in new construction as compared with $683 million in 1963 and $373 million in 1962. The handling of these cases has been greatly speeded up and the cases now pending before the Commission while large in number on the whole represent a normal working backlog.

With respect to the rates of natural gas producers the Commission has made progress in developing a system of regulation that is fair, effective and administratively feasible, but the payoff stage is still some months away. Meanwhile, by the flexible use of the settlement device the Commission has been able to hold the backlog steady in the last 3 years while it has been putting into operation this new system of regulation on an "area" basis, which the Commission believes is better adapted to the economics and structure of the natural gas producing industry than company-by-company determinations.

As early as 1960 the Commission had issued a policy statement in which the Commission expressed its intention to set rates on an area basis. The Commission divided the Nation's gas producing fields into 23 areas and announced interim rates for each area during the period in which formal area rate proceedings were in progress to determine permanent rates. Two area rate cases had been initiated but little had as yet been done to prepare them for trial. The Commission since mid-1961 has used the system of interim ceiling prices although in a number of areas the initial rates have proved excessive and have been reduced.

The Commission has moved ahead on the area rate program, and four proceedings are now underway. One of these (the Permian Basin case) is now in its final stages, the hearing examiner having rendered his decision and the case being now set for argument (beginning February 8) and decision before the Commission. By the end of this fiscal year the Commission hopes to have established a pattern for the area rate cases which will enable it to prescribe fair and reasonable rates in every producing area in the country within the following 2 or 3 years. To devise an effective system of regulation for natural gas producers has proved to be one of the greatest challenges with which any administrative agency has ever been confronted. The most difficult part of that task is now accomplished.

The net result of the Commission's activities in the last 3 years is that much of the regulatory uncertainty and delay which plagued the gas industry 3 years ago has been remedied. The natural gas industry is financially sound and gas is in sufficient supply so that we are encouraging expansions to take on new markets where natural gas is not presently available. At the same time producer rates have been stabilized at a nationwide average of approximately 16 cents per M.c.f. and the city-gate price has declined, so that consumers are now able to buy gas more cheaply than they could in 1961.

(c) Electric utility regulation: Electric rate regulation by the Federal Power Commission, which was a neglected responsibility 3 years ago, is now a going activity. Three years ago most of the companies subject to FPC jurisdiction did not even file their rates with the Commission, and the filings which were received were routinely processed. Today most of the electric power companies which the Commission considers are subject to FPC jurisdiction have filed their wholesale rate schedules, and within the limits of existing manpower the Commission's power staff gives close study to the filings. For fiscal year 1962, prior to the beginning of the buildup of electric rate work, rate reductions totaled only $127 thousand. Thus far in fiscal year 1965, reductions of more than $4 million have already been filed and accepted. An undetermined amount of additional reductions were made by the electric power companies in rate revisions put into effect incident to the initial filings with the Commission.

Even more important than the specific rate reductions is the fact that the public, cooperative and private systems which are dependent upon wholesale purchases for their bulk power supply are now aware that there is a forum where the reasonableness of wholesale rates can be adjudicated. This has greatly improved their bargaining position in dealing with the major companies which constitute their sources of supply. In addition, the work of the FPC on wholesale rates and our supporting audits of utility books can be of major assistance to the State Commissions in regulating the retail rates for electric power.

What is at stake in establishing effective regulation of the electric power industry is not merely the assurance of fair rates to consumers but also the efficient use of our natural resources. The long-term guarantee of a wholesale power supply at fair rates and on reasonable terms under Federal regulation would make it unnecessary for some of the distributors to construct generating plants of uneconomically small size. Such plants are generally wasteful both of capital and fuel.

In the hydroelectric field the Commission has halved its backlog of new license applications, thus releasing a billion dollars of new construction to help stimulate the economy. What remains is substantially on a current basis. The Commission has initiated new measures to insure full utilization of the recreation potential of the hundreds of private projects which are now licensed by the FPC and many more which will be licensed in the future. It has also taken steps to require closer policing of the safety features of these impoundments in order to avoid any possibility of such catastrophies as have happened recently in Italy, France, and Spain as a result of dam failure or overtopping.

One of the most important activities of the Commission in the power field has been the conduct of the national power survey. This project which has been carried out in cooperation with industry advisory committees representing all segments of the electric power industry, the privately owned systems, Federal and municipal systems, and the REA cooperatives. In the survey the Commission has sought to plot a course of coordinated growth for the industry which by 1980 would make possible the use by all power systems of the most advanced generation and transmission technology. The survey report, which was released on December 13, 1964, suggests patterns for joint planning among the power companies for system expansion and for pooling their systems through heavy transmission interconnections. The goal is lower cost electricity for all Americans.

The power survey was conducted under provisions of the Power Act which direct the Commission to encourage the voluntary interconnection of the Nation's power systems. It is an outstanding example of Government and industry cooperation in the utility field. It represents a milestone in the history of cooperation in an industry where factional differences run deep and where teamwork among industry segments requires constant encouragement.

The Commission has also used its influence to encourage a higher level of research in the electric power industry, and greater cooperation among industry elements in carrying on research activities. At its instance an ad hoc committee of leading representatives from all industry segments, the electric equipment manufacturers, and the universities, is now formulating a proposal for industrywide coordination of research in the fields of power equipment and power utilization.

The general goals of the Federal Power Commission in the electric power field are an integrated, low-cost industry, a technologically advanced industry, an industry with all segments working together, and an industry in which the benefits of improved technology and intersystem coordination are shared in fair measure with ultimate consumers.

In the last 3 years the trend of electric power rates like those of natural gas has been down. These reductions in energy costs have contributed to the ability of other industries to hold the price line.

The Commission's program for both the electric power and natural gas industries under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations has been designed to promote the growth of these major sources of energy in a manner that will make the most efficient use of our capital and exhaustible fuel resources. Both of these industries are financially healthy, technologically alert, and are bringing essential energy to consumers at wholesale prices which are lower now than when we took office.

Natural gas fact sheet for State of Illinois, 1963

	Number of customers	Volumes sold (thousand cubic feet)	Revenue (dollars)	Average revenue dollars per thousand cubic feet
(1) Annual total natural gas retail sale bill (from Bureau of Mines):				
(a) Residential	2,369,000	289,550,000	326,618,000	1.128
(b) Commercial	153,000	74,887,000	65,057,000	.869
(c) Industrial	(1)	276,027,000	115,610,000	.419
(d) Total	(1)	[2] 640,464,000	507,285,000	.792

	Volume (thousand cubic feet)	Percent of total
(2) Gas supply (from Bureau of Mines):		
(a) Local production	9,459,000	1.36
(b) Received from outside State	688,128,000	98.64
(c) Total supply	[2] 697,587,000	100.00

	Cents per thousand cubic feet
(3) Average price charged by interstate pipeline companies to distributors:	
1961	31.58
1963	30.65

	Amount
(4) Dollars refunded by interstate pipeline companies to distributors between July 1, 1961, and June 30, 1964	$40,453,723

[1] Not available.
[2] Difference between gas supplied and gas sold is in gas transmitted out of State, used by companies, lost, and unaccounted for, and net change in underground storage volumes.

THE PRESIDENT'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROGRAM AND LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, since the announcement, of the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program, there has been growing public concern that the program will be used not only to limit the flow of private capital to industrialized nations, but also to the less developed countries.

In view of the great potential harm that restrictions on the flow of private U.S. capital to less developed countries may use to our entire postwar effort in these countries, I asked Secretary Dillon and Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, to give me a clarification of the administration's position in this regard.

In response to my letter of March 9, 1965, Secretary Dillon categorically stated that the voluntary balance-of-payments program will not be used to this effect. He made it clear that under the 5 percent Federal Reserve guideline, commercial banks have been asked to give the highest priority to loans to less developed countries. He also reaffirmed that the encouragement of productive private investment in the less developed countries remains administration policy.

In response to an identical letter from me, Chairman Martin makes the following key points:

First. He does not not believe that the President's program conflicts in any serious way with the objective to establish viable private sectors in less developed countries.

Second. Direct investment and other types of long-term investment which are directed toward efficient and productive investment in already existing U.S. enterprises or new enterprises in less developed countries would clearly not be out of spirit with the President's program, as it is likely that the capital outflows required would in many cases be offset by exports of U.S. equipment and materials and returns of investment income.

Third. To the extent that a slowing of U.S. bank credit may in some cases have seriously adverse effects on the balance-of-payments positions of individual less developed countries, that would of course be a factor for U.S. banks to take into consideration in assigning relative priorities to the credit demands they receive from those particular countries.

In view of the concern of the financial community of the country in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that this exchange of correspondence, as well as a Federal Reserve press release dated March 8, containing guidelines to commercial banks, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

MARCH 9, 1965.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am deeply disturbed by reports to the effect that the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program will be used to limit the flow of private U.S. capital to less developed countries. This would represent a reversal of the principle laid down in the interest equalization tax and other legislation, such as the proposed 30-percent investment tax credit which would encourage private U.S. investment in less developed countries. A limitation on the flow of private U.S. investment to less developed countries could undermine our foreign aid program and be injurious to our desire to establish viable private sectors in less developed countries. There are also involved questions of net gain in any such policy.

I would appreciate it if you could furnish me with a report on this matter at your earliest convenience.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 17, 1965.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACK: The reports you received to the effect that the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program will be used to limit the flow of private U.S. capita to less developed countries are wrong. It has been made clear on several recent occasions by the administration that not only the interest equalization tax but the voluntary restraint program is directed at U.S. capital outflow to developed countries. You may be interested in the enclosed quotations from various recent statements and press releases.

With respect to bank lending under the 5-percent Federal Reserve guideline, banks have been asked to give the highest priority to loans to less developed countries. There may be occasions, of course, where banks will want to use the guidelines as a reason for refusing a loan request from a less developed country applicant to whom the bank does not want to lend for entirely different reasons.

You may be sure that the administration's policy of encouraging productive private investment in the less developed countries has not changed. We do expect, of course, that less developed countries will not become channels for an indirect flow of U.S. capital to other advanced countries.

I was glad to hear from you on this matter.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

Enclosure.

QUOTATION FROM LETTER OF SECRETARY CONNOR TO AMERICAN BUSINESS FIRMS DATED MARCH 12, 1965

First, we regard the national objective of increasing the contribution by private enterprise to growth in less developed countries of such importance that we do not wish this

program to inhibit the flow of these investments.

QUOTATIONS FROM FEDERAL RESERVE PRESS RELEASE DATED MARCH 5, 1965, ON GUIDELINES FOR COMMERCIAL BANKS

Within the 5-percent guideline, absolute priority should be given to bona fide export credits. Credits that substitute for cash sales or for sales customarily financed out of nonbank or foreign funds are not entitled to priority.

With respect to nonexport credits, banks should give the highest priority to loans to less developed countries and should avoid restrictive policies that would place an undue burden on countries such as Canada and Japan, which are heavily dependent on U.S. financing, and on the United Kingdom, which is suffering from balance-of-payments difficulties.

MARCH 9, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM MCC. MARTIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am deeply disturbed by reports to the effect that the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program will be used to limit the flow of private U.S. capital to less developed countries. This would represent a reversal of the principle laid down in the interest equalization tax and other legislation, such as the proposed 30-percent investment tax credit which would encourage private U.S. investment in less developed countries. A limitation on the flow of private U.S. investment to less developed countries could undermine our foreign aid program and be injurious to our desire to establish viable private sectors in less developed countries. There are also involved questions of net gain in any such policy.

I would appreciate it if you could furnish me with a report on this matter at your earliest convenience.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, March 16, 1965.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for your letter of March 9, 1965, expressing your concern with respect to reports that the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program will be used to limit the flow of private U.S. capital to less-developed countries.

As you know, the Federal Reserve is not directly concerned with the part of the President's program that relates to direct investment. Nevertheless, I should like to make some general comments on the program, in connection with our desire, as you put it in your letter, to establish viable private sectors in less-developed countries. I do not believe that the President's program conflicts in any serious way with that objective.

As I see it, the accomplishment of that objective depends in very great degree, first of all, on what the less-developed countries do themselves to create an economic and social environment conducive to sustainable growth sparked by private enterprise.

The contribution U.S. private enterprise can then make, where the conditions are favorable, is threefold. It can supplement the long-term capital resources of the country. It can embody the capital which it brings to the country, together with savings subsequently generated within the country, in well-selected and efficiently planned physical facilities and it can operate these facilities efficiently, helping, as it does so, to raise the general level of skills and productivity both of management and of labor in the country. Where existing U.S. enterprises are already performing these functions in less-developed countries, or where they see new opportunities of doing so effectively, it is likely that the capital outflows required will in many cases be offset by exports of U.S. equipment and materials and returns of investment income. In such cases the carrying out of direct investment plans would clearly not be out of spirit with the President's balance-of-payments program.

I am sure you will agree that the growth of viable private sectors in less-developed countries depends very importantly on continued growth of world trade and economic growth in industrial countries. But this in turn depends on the maintenance of a healthy international payments system. Under present circumstances, it is urgently important that the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit be reduced, so that the dollar may continue to play its role as the keystone of a sound and flexible international payments system, and so that the economic growth of the United States—and indeed of the whole Western World—may continue without the disturbances that would be occasioned by failure to solve this balance of payments problem.

For these reasons, I believe it can fairly be concluded that reduction of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit will contribute significantly and in a relatively permanent way to the viability of private sectors in the economies of the less-developed countries, while whatever inconveniences may be imposed on those countries by the program for reducing the deficit will be transitory and of minor importance.

I mention these possible inconveniences because I do think it is possible that there may be some demands for U.S. bank credit from less-developed countries that will not be fully met this year. However, if that should happen, it need not be more than an inconvenience to the countries concerned. Other sources of credit are available to would-be borrowers from U.S. banks, and it may be that the borrowers will have to make greater use of other sources this year, including European sources as well as the banking systems of their own countries.

To the extent that a slowing of U.S. bank credit outflow may, in some cases, have seriously adverse effects on the balance-of-payments positions of individual less-developed countries, that would, of course, be a factor for U.S. banks to take into consideration in assigning relative priorities to the credit demands they receive from those particular countries. But, as you know, the total outflow of U.S. bank credit reached an unusually high level last year, and I am confident that a considerable cutback in the flow this year need not have widespread serious adverse effects on the balances of payments of the less-developed countries.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.

PRESS RELEASE OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE

MARCH 5, 1965.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System today issued a set of 14 guidelines for commercial banks to follow in complying with the President's program to improve the Nation's balance-of-payments position, in part through voluntary efforts to restrain foreign lending and investment. It was recognized that, in restraining the growth of loans to foreigners, banks will be foregoing some of the gains that would otherwise have accrued to them. Nevertheless, the Board stated, if a voluntary program is to be effective, the national interest must come first in decisions on future specific loan transactions.

The guidelines for foreign lending operations specify that absolute priority should be given to all bona fide export credits. With respect to nonexport credits, banks are expected to give the highest priority to loans to less developed countries and to avoid restrictive policies that would place an undue burden on Canada, Japan, and the United Kingdom. To meet these priorities the guidelines contemplate that nonexport credits to other advanced countries will be cut back to the extent needed to achieve the goal of the President's program.

The objective of the program is that outstanding bank credit to nonresidents of the United States not rise above the amount outstanding at the end of 1964 by more than 5 percent. Banks which find themselves in excess of the target are expected to reduce their foreign loans as quickly as possible, and, in the most extreme case, to bring their lending back to the target level within the next 12 months.

The guidelines cover the method of calculating the base for an individual bank against which the rise of 5 percent in outstanding loans can be measured. They also clarify how those banks already in excess of the target as a result of year-to-date operations will be expected to bring their operations within the policy objectives. The guidelines spell out, among other topics, the relationship of trust departments to the program, the handling of financial transactions for customers, the position of Edge Act Corporations, the operations of foreign branches of U.S. banks and of U.S. branches of foreign banks.

In considering problem areas involved in the development of the guidelines, the Board had the benefit of technical advice from the following specialists in commercial bank foreign operations:

Mr. Roger Anderson, Continental Illinois National Bank, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Harry P. Barrand, Jr., Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., New York, N.Y.; Mr. Alfred W. Barth, the Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N.Y.; Mr. W. A. Hurst, Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association, San Francisco, Calif.; Mr. John M. Meyer, Jr., Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, New York; and Mr. J. J. Wieckowski, Girard Trust Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Board pointed out that the role of these individuals was advisory only. They were not asked to approve or disapprove the guidelines nor to assume any responsibility in connection with their formulation.

The Board indicated that the guidelines, effective immediately, will be reviewed from time to time in the light of experience gained from operation of the program. The interpretations are designed to help individual banks make the decisions regarding their own operations that are required to insure an effective program.

Copies of the new guidelines are being made available through the Federal Reserve banks to all commercial banks in the country. Banks having questions concerning their application are urged to consult with the Federal Reserve bank of their district.

PREFACE TO GUIDELINES

The following guidelines have been designed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for use in implementing President Johnson's program for the voluntary curtailment of foreign credit by banks. They will be in effect until modified or supplemented. However, they may be changed from time to time in the light of new circumstances and in the light of the

experience gained as the program goes forward. The guidelines should be helpful to individual banks as they play their own particular part in the achievement of the President's overall balance-of-payments program, and each bank should feel free at any time to discuss its problems with the Federal Reserve bank of its district.

It is clear that banks, in undertaking a voluntary role in the program, are being called upon to make sacrifices. In restraining the growth of their loans to foreigners they will be foregoing some of the gains that would otherwise have accrued to them. But, if a voluntary program is to be effective, decisions on future specific loan transactions must be made primarily with an eye to the national interest rather than profits. The achievement of the President's goal will be in the long-term interest, not only of the Nation, but also of the individual institutions which are now being called upon to forgo immediate advantage or gain.

1. Establishing a target base for an individual bank: The objective of the program is that outstanding bank credit to nonresidents of the United States not rise above the amount outstanding at the end of 1964 by more than 5 percent, subject to the conditions set forth in guideline No. 3.

The following steps are involved in calculating the base, and the amount of credit outstanding on any particular date, for an individual bank:

1. Take outstanding claims of U.S. banking offices on foreigners as of December 31, 1964, as required to be reported on Treasury Department foreign exchange forms B–2 and B–3. Contingent accounts, such as unused balances of letters of credit and commitments to lend, are excluded from the base. (For further information reference is made to the instructions printed on forms B–2 and B–3.)

2. Subtract from this amount any claims for account of customers included on the forms, as well as any participations in individual loans arranged by the Export-Import Bank or made with Export-Import Bank guarantees.

3. Add any claims not reportable on forms B–2 and B–3, such as long-term foreign securities and permanent capital invested in foreign branches and subsidiaries.

4. Compensating balances, or any other claim on the lending bank of the debtor or of any other person by arrangement or understanding with the debtor, should not be deducted from loans or other claims on foreigners for purposes of determining the base.

5. It is expected that a simplified form for making the above calculation, and for making monthly reports on foreign credits, will be furnished to the banks within a short time.

Banks which are exempted from reporting on the Treasury forms because their foreign credits are below the minimum reporting requirement are nevertheless included in the program.

2. Participations in Export-Import Bank loans and loans guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank: Participations in individual export loans arranged by the Export-Import Bank, loans with Export-Import Bank guarantees or insurance, and holdings of Export-Import Portfolio Fund participations are excluded from the 5 percent target.

The role of the Export-Import Bank within the framework of the President's program will be coordinated by the National Advisory Council for International Monetary and Financial Problems.

3. Banks in excess of 5 percent target: It is clearly recognized that some banks may currently be above the 5 percent target because of loans made prior to February 11, 1965, or may subsequently be brought above the target as a result of (a) binding commitments entered into before February 11, or (b) the extension of bona fide export credits, or (c) the extension of credits at the specific request of an agency of the U.S. Government. A bank in such circumstances would not be considered to be acting in a manner inconsistent with the program; however, it should reduce its claims on foreigners to 105 percent of the base as quickly as possible. Even in the most extreme case, this reduction should be accomplished within the next 12 months.

Such a bank will be invited periodically to discuss with the Federal Reserve bank of its district the steps it has taken and proposes to take to bring about the reduction of its claims on foreigners consistent with these guidelines.

Banks with bona fide commitments are clearly not being asked to refuse to honor such commitments, even if honoring them involves a temporary excess of lending above the target. However, banks would be expected to seize every opportunity to withdraw or reduce commitments, including credit lines, that are not of a firm nature, and to ensure that drawings under credit lines are kept to normal levels and usage. At time of renewal, all credit lines should be reviewed in light of their consistency with the voluntary foreign credit restraint program. Proposed extensions of renewals of existing bona fide commitments should be reviewed in the same manner.

4. Loan priorities: Within the 5 percent guideline, absolute priority should be given to bona fide export credits. Credits that substitute for cash sales or for sales customarily financed out of nonbank or foreign funds are not entitled to priority.

With respect to nonexport credits, banks should give the highest priority to loans to less developed countries and should avoid restrictive policies that would place an undue burden on countries such as Canada and Japan, which are heavily dependent on U.S. financing, and on the United Kingdom, which is suffering from balance-of-payments difficulties.

Given the probability of some expansion of the end-of-1964 volume of loans for financing exports and the priorities established for the less developed countries, as well as the need to avoid restrictive practices with regard to Canada, Japan, and Britain, it is expected that nonexport credit to the other advanced countries will be cut back to the extent needed to achieve the goal of the President's program.

Without attempting to specify all types of loans that will need to be restricted, it is obvious that credits to developed countries, that can be cut back with benefit to our balance of payments and with the least adverse side-effects include: credits to finance third-country trade; credits to finance local-currency expenditures outside the United States; credits to finance fixed or working capital needs; and all other nonexport credits to developed countries that do not suffer from balance-of-payments difficulties.

5. Bank sales of foreign assets to U.S. residents: In general, banks should not expand their lending abroad by selling to U.S. residents (including U.S. banks) claims on foreigners existing as of the base date and replacing such assets with other loans to foreigners. Sales to U.S. residents of foreign securities owned on the base date, which would be free of the interest equalization tax, or of loan participations, could assist an individual bank to stay within the 5 percent target, but would clearly not benefit the U.S. payments position. Therefore, in the event of any such sales the bank's base should be reduced by an amount equivalent thereto.

6. Banks with no foreign loans outstanding on December 31, 1964: In general, banks with no previous foreign lending experience would be expected not to make foreign loans during 1965. However, bona fide export loans to foreigners may be made in reasonable amounts, provided this financing does not represent a shift from previous U.S. or foreign sources of financing. Banks making foreign loans for the first time should take precautions to insure that their activities do not become a means through which credit is extended to foreign borrowers who have been denied credit by established lenders cooperating in the voluntary program.

7. Banks whose previous foreign business has consisted almost entirely of export financing: The few banks falling in this category would ordinarily be expected to keep within the 5-percent ceiling. Since they would have no maturing nonexport loans to provide funds for additional export credits and would therefore need to rely upon nonrenewal of maturing export loans, reasonable amounts in excess of the target from time to time would not be considered in conflict with the program. But every effort should be made by such banks to keep their lending within the ceiling. They should take care to insure that export loans do not represent a shift from previous U.S. or foreign sources of financing.

8. Trust departments: Managing officers of trust departments should be made familiar with the voluntary restraint effort. They should bear the purpose of that program in mind in making any acquisitions of foreign obligations for trust accounts. For example, they should not exercise their authority under any trust account to acquire foreign obligations which, in the absence of the restraint program, would have been acquired by the bank for its own account. Pension funds, including those administered by banks, will be furnished separate guidelines, as part of the program to restrain foreign credits of nonbank financial institutions.

9. Financial transactions for customers: While banks must, of course, follow instructions given to them by their customers, it is expected that, in buying foreign investments for customers, they will be guided by the principles inherent in the President's balance-of-payments program. They should not encourage customers to place liquid funds outside the United States. Banks should not place with customers foreign obligations which, in the absence of the restraint program, they would have acquired or held for their own account.

10. Foreign branches: It is assumed, of course, that U.S. banks having branches, as well as subsidiaries and affiliates, in foreign countries will not utilize them to avoid the foreign credit restraint program for U.S. banks.

Foreign branches have independent sources of funds in the countries in which they are located and from third countries, in many cases through the attraction of Euro-dollar deposits. The balance-of-payments program is not designed to hamper the lending activities of the foreign branches insofar as the funds utilized are derived from foreign sources and do not add to the dollar outflow. Concern arises only in those cases where the resources are derived (directly or indirectly) from the United States.

Total claims of the head office on oversea branches, including permanent capital invested in, as well as balances due from, branches, represent bank credit to nonresidents for purposes of the program.

11. Problems of Edge Act corporations: Edge Act and agreement corporations are included in the voluntary credit restraint effort. The foreign loans and investments of such a corporation may be combined with those of the parent bank for the purposes of the program, or separate targets may be set for the parent bank and the subsidiary.

An Edge Act corporation that has not yet undertaken any significant volume of loans and investments may take as a base, alone and not in combination with its parent, its paid-in capital and surplus, up to $2.5 million, even though an equivalent amount of

foreign loans and investments had not yet been made as of December 31, 1964.

12. U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks: Branches and agencies of foreign banks located in the United States are requested to comply with the principles of the program of credit restraint applicable to domestic banks.

13. Substitution of export credit for credit for other purposes: Banks should be on the alert to avoid granting credit to domestic customers if the result would be to aid the latter in making foreign loans or investments inconsistent with the program. Even export credit to foreigners, if it supplants credit previously obtained from foreign sources and thus frees the foreign funds for other uses, may be detrimental to the U.S. payments position.

This is obviously a difficult area and one in which there is considerable room for possibly damaging substitution of domestic for foreign financing, and for substitution of export credits to foreigners for other credits to foreigners. In general, success will depend on the ability of banks to identify loans that are inconsistent with the program and on the application of the Department of Commerce program with respect to foreign credit and investment by nonfinancial firms.

14. Management of a bank's liquid funds: Banks that have placed their own funds abroad for short-term investment purposes, including U.S. dollar deposits outside the United States or the acquisition of non-U.S. money market paper, should refrain from increasing such deposits and investments and should, in a reasonable and orderly manner, seek to reduce them. Since such funds are ordinarily placed outside the United States solely to provide a slightly higher rate of return, they are strong candidates for reduction under the program.

This guideline applies equally to deposits and investments payable in foreign currencies and to those payable in U.S. dollars.

This guideline does not call for a reduction in necessary working balances held with foreign correspondents, although such balances are also considered claims on nonresidents for the puropses of the program.

THE U.S. BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT AND WORLD MONETARY REFORM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, should our latest attempt to cut down on our balance-of-payments deficit continue to be as effective as it appears to be at present, we may be laying the groundwork for effective negotiations concerning the reform of the existing international monetary system.

Since the annual International Monetary Fund meeting in Tokyo, last October, there has been growing recognition that, in the future, expansion of the world's monetary needs should not be left entirely to happenstances; namely, the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. As in the case of other countries, it could be reasonably expected that the U.S. payments deficit will be brought under control as soon as possible. Tacit recognition was also given to the need to entrust an increasingly influential role to the IMF in the operation of the international monetary system. But it was evident that as long as our European friends possessed ample dollar reserves, they would continue to insist that the United States clamp down on its balance-of-payments deficit, before they would agree to meaningful negotiations about the future of the international monetary system. President de Gaulle's February 4, 1965, press conference was only the latest indication of the generally held European attitude.

As the threat of the reversal of the dollar outflow appears on the horizon, voices in Europe are being heard in regard to the dangers that this will cause to the stability of the international monetary system and world economic expansion. Perhaps it is too early to say that there is an immediate threat to the functioning of the system, or that our latest effort to deal with the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit has been successful. But this new situation makes entirely clear what the world would be up against if the U.S. payments deficit would be "solved," without at the same time having arrangements made to provide for an adequate supplement to the existing gold-exchange standard, which forms the basis of the present international monetary system. Given the very substantial international asset position of the United States and its vital global commitments, it would not be in our interest if we were to eliminate vital economic and military programs on the ground of financal necessity.

The groundwork for new negotiations concerning international monetary reform should be laid now, regardless of the day-to-day changes in the international financial situation of the United States and Europe.

Several recent expressions of opinion by Secretary Dillon and by leading international economists lend new urgency to the need for a basic reform of the international monetary system. I refer specifically to Secretary Dillon's testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee on March 23; and to testimony before the International Finance Subcommittee of the Senate Banking Committee, last week, by Dr. Walter Salant, of the Brookings Institution, and principal author of the "U.S. Balance of Payments in 1968," and to testimony by Charles Kindleberger, professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Although it is still commonly believed that there is presently no shortage of international liquidity to finance expanding trade and payments, and although no liquidity crisis, with its accompanying deflationary shrinkage of world trade and investment generally, is said to be foreseen for several years, or at least not until the United States eliminates its balance-of-payments deficit, I believe—and I have been joined in this by my Republican colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee—that the turning point is nearer than is generally realized. This viewpoint is now receiving more and more support.

For more than a year and a half, the Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee have urged that the administration seize the initiative, and call a well-planned international monetary conference to initiate basic reform of the system before the world is faced with a deflationary crisis. The administration now agrees with the need for basic reform, but is awaiting the elimination of our payments deficit before taking specific action. The administration cannot wait much longer; time is clearly running out.

Talk of a dollar shortage is gradually replacing concern over the dollar glut. On March 23, Secretary Dillon declared that as the United States is about to bring the balance of payments into balance, the "danger" for the world in the future would be a "shortage of international reserves, rather than an excess." When the United States "gets into balance," he declared, the nations "will need to consider whether some other form of reserve asset than the dollar will be needed."

In his testimony on the balance of payments, Dr. Salant showed that a sharp improvement in the basic balance occurred in 1964; and he concluded that it reflected fundamental improvement. He told the Committee:

> Most, although not perhaps all, of the required fundamental adjustment in prices and incomes has been made.

As for the large capital outflows, which contributed to the increased total deficit, he believes they represent a temporary phenomenon, and are likely to taper off, even in the absence of restraints, or at least to cease to increase much in the coming years.

In discussing the dangers ahead, Dr. Salant noted several recent events that have unsettled the monetary environment and shaken the position that international liquidity was adequate to world needs. The British payments crisis, the French attitudes toward the dollar and international monetary reform, and the continuing shrinkage in the U.S. gold stock, in the face of mounting short-term dollar liabilities, have had the effect of reducing international liquidity. For one thing, these influences have given rise to increased private hoarding of gold, which puts further pressure on the whole system. This is happening against a background of increasing world trade, which is increasing the need for reserves. Dr. Salant said:

> In the face of these developments I find it hard to see how one can any longer maintain that there is no shortage of liquidity now.

He added:

> The measures the United States has taken to reduce capital outflows have increased Japan's dependence on other sources of capital and on its own official reserves. The United Kingdom feels less able to lose reserves. In short, countries in deficit or in precarious balance are feeling more pressed about their international liquidity. But countries with surpluses do not seem to feel they have too much; although the Continental European countries complain about too much total liquidity, they do not take the actions necessary to reduce its international component; i.e., they do not seem willing to lose international reserves. To put the same things in terms of balance-of-payments deficits and surpluses, the desire of deficit countries to cut their deficits has intensified, but this has not been offset by an increase in the willingness of surplus countries to reduce their surpluses. This whole situation adds up to the makings of a scramble for liquidity, which could result in a world monetary crisis.

Dr. Salant believes the adverse effects of not ending our balance-of-payments deficit and our gold drain are less than the dangers that could result from ending them too rapidly. He fears that the United States may "join a competitive scramble for liquidity" that would simply aggravate the existing strains in the system.

If Dr. Salant is correct and if, in fact, basic balance has been largely achieved, then the wisdom of the administration's controls over capital outflows becomes particularly suspect. One danger may well be that they do their work too quickly and too well. The strengthening of the dollar on the foreign-exchange markets and the rise of the Eurodollar rate indicate that the program may be sharply reducing the dollar outflow to Western Europe.

In his testimony before the Committee, Dr. Kindleberger specifically noted the deflationary consequences that success of the President's program may have. He pointed out:

To halt capital flows to Europe at this time by voluntary restrictions, taxation, or otherwise, is to tighten interest rates in Europe, at long term, rather than at short. There are plenty of short-term funds, as evidenced by the dollars held by the private market and those that could be acquired by the banking system from official holders. The need is rather for long-term funds. A reduction in their amount may cut investment, produce recession, and put real, instead of liquidity balance-of-payments pressure on this country.

I am concerned that our balance-of-payments measures may push Europe into deflation, which would create real balance-of-payments surpluses.

Dr. Kindleberger might have noted the likelihood of a spillover into our own economy of deflation in Western Europe.

Not only do these considerations lend urgency to the need for basic reform of the system, but they also make more likely the reaching of an international agreement. Once a dollar shortage begins to threaten, European nations will show a greater willingness to make significant progress in bringing up to date a monetary system that was created to serve the entirely different world economy that existed at the end of World War II.

Some of the international monetary issues that are emerging are effectively discussed by Bernard D. Nossiter, in an article published in the Washington Post of March 13, 1965, and by Murray J. Rossant, in his column in the New York Times of March 22, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that these articles and one from the New York Times of March 24, and an editorial from the Washington Post of March 18, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1965]

U.S. DOLLAR FLOW ABROAD IS REVERSED—BANKS AND BUSINESS RESPOND TO JOHNSON APPEAL TO CURB OUTGO

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

PARIS, March 12.—Dollars are flowing from Europe back to the United States for the first time in years.

American bankers and corporation treasurers, particularly the bankers, are responding to President Johnson's appeal for restraint with an unexpected zest.

European financial authorities had doubted that President Johnson's appeal for self-imposed curbs on the dollar outflow would work. They said as much to Washington in private talks. But now some of those authorities are prepared to eat their words.

A [redacted] check today of key monetary figures in Basle, Frankfort, and Paris turned up the same story in all three financial centers: the dollar has suddenly assumed an unlooked-for strength.

No estimates of the reverse flow are available here. But two objective indicators show what has been happening.

A month ago, when Mr. Johnson issued his call to business leaders, 1 dollar could be swapped for 4.325 Swiss francs. Yesterday, the dollar fetched 4.345 francs. The difference, less than 0.5 percent, does not seem like much. But when currency deals are made in tens of millions of dollars, a few centimes for each mounts up.

A second indicator is the new and higher rate that lenders are charging for Eurodollars. These are the dollars that Americans and others deposit in banks here to lend anywhere. In the last few days, borrowers have had to pay 0.5 percent more for these dollars, up to 5.5 percent, for loans of 6 months. This is a clear sign that Eurodollars are scarcer.

This dramatic turn of affairs has produced some curious changes in the European financial press. For months, financial writers here have been complaining about a surfeit of dollars and the slack ways of American financial life.

DOLLAR GAP NOW FEARED

But just the other day, Les Echos, the French Wall Street Journal, complained that there is now danger of a dollar gap or shortage that could cause deflation in Europe. Similarly, the Financial Times of London was fretting this morning over the prospect that the different moves of Washington and London may curb world trade by holding back on the currencies that finance the great part of it.

None of this means that the conservative men who run Europe's banks are convinced that the United States has solved its balance-of-payments problem. They fear that the so far successful appeal to American businessmen will have only a limited life.

Most of all, they still think there are too many dollars floating around the world. The continental bankers will not be happy until the Federal Reserve System begins to mop up some of those dollars and lifts American interest rates to attract more dollars at home.

The sudden reversal in the dollar flow, the authorities agree, stems in part from the artificial buildup of dollars sent here before the President's message. American banks and corporations, fearing that the administration would impose controls on their loans and investments, poured dollars into Europe at a great rate to beat the gun. Now these unneeded dollars are being repatriated.

Some banks clearly exceeded the guidelines for foreign lending laid down by the Federal Reserve. These banks are also bringing dollars back to come into line.

Corporation treasurers also appear to be heeding the President's plea to stop investing their spare cash in the profitable European market. Moreover, continental bankers say that some American corporations have told their European affiliates that American money will be tight for them this year. The affiliates have been urged to borrow what they need in Europe.

Indeed, the sudden shortage of funds has led some bankers outside the principal countries to fear that economic activity in Europe will be affected.

An important banking official in Madrid said last week that the United States should now come forward with its own plan to reform the international monetary system in a way that will avoid deflation.

But he is still in the minority. European bankers in the more powerful nations generally agree that Washington should not present any plan until the American deficit is completely wiped out.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 22, 1965]

WHITHER THE DOLLAR?—QUESTION OF SHORTAGE REPLACING GLUT DRAWS ATTENTION IN MONETARY WORLD

(By M. J. Rossant)

Will the dollar glut be replaced by a dollar shortage? For the first time in over a decade, this question is receiving serious attention in monetary and financial circles here and abroad. The quick success of the Johnson administration's new voluntary program to curb the outflow of dollars is largely responsible. Even the most skeptical have been impressed by its initial impact.

When the program was first announced doubts were voiced, here and abroad, about its effectiveness. These doubts are fading as the flood of dollars going to Europe is being shut off.

The glut has not yet been checked. Foreign governments in fact have been stepping up their purchases of gold from the United States with excess dollars they have accumulated. But for the most part, these surpluses were amassed before Washington began putting pressure on business.

FEARS ARE GROWING

The notion of a shortage is just a notion, but fears that it will materialize are growing. If it comes, it could mean a deflationary shrinkage of trade and economic growth, according to delegates at the American Bankers Association's monetary conference held last week in Princeton. The dollar shortage seers were in a minority, but it is one that is growing in numbers.

Those who think that the glut may be replaced by a serious shortage are not merely wishful thinkers. They say that in the 1950's—the whole world was preoccupied by fears of a dollar shortage long after Washington began running huge deficits that produce the huge excess of dollars in Europe.

Now, they argue that concern about the dollar glut is heightening at a time when there is evidence of dollar scarcity.

Hal B. Lary of the National Bureau of Economic Research has observed that shifts in a country's payments position can take place with amazing rapidity, achieving a snowballing effect. The United States has had this sort of experience in running its deficits, but it can also work in reverse.

The prospect of a return to a surplus position has been emphasized by Robert Triffin of Yale University. He has said that the United States has succeeded in making "great improvement" in cutting down on the huge drains that plagued it in the past, an improvement that has been masked by the big and abnormal outflow of private capital. Now that the administration has taken steps to cut the private outflow, the overall deficit could be transformed into a surplus in relatively short order.

A GOOD FORECASTER

Mr. Triffin, who is the author of the controversial Triffin plan for reforming the international monetary system, has a good record in the precarious art of forecasting monetary movements. Other monetary students, including Walter S. Salant of the Brookings Institution, have made similar analyses, suggesting that the tide is about to turn.

This does not mean that Henry H. Fowler, who is slated to take over as head of the Treasury Department, can sit back and relax. But it may give him time to learn the

ropes of international finance and gain the confidence of foreign officials.

If progress can be sustained and the dollar glut replaced by a shortage, the administration will be in a position to resume pressing for additional reform of the international monetary system. The issue of reform has been deadlocked since the dollar came under attack, but Europe may be amenable to change once the dollar is no longer acting as the financial fuel for expansion.

According to those who foresee a possible dollar shortage, a lot depends on a continued holddown on the outflow of private capital. Mr. Salant believes that this drain will decline naturally, but many others are less sure.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1965]

WARNING VOICED ON WORLD FUNDS—DILLON CITES THE DANGER OF A RESERVES SHORTAGE RATHER THAN EXCESS—U.S. DEFICIT HOLDS KEY—FUTURE LEVELING OF PAYMENTS BALANCE WOULD AFFECT THE HOLDINGS IN THE WEST

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 23.—Secretary of the Treasury Dougles Dillon, making his final appearance before a congressional committee, said today that the "danger" for the world in the future would be a "shortage of international reserves rather than an excess."

Mr. Dillon told the House Banking Committee that this danger would rise "since our balance of payments is about to be brought into balance."

Deficits in U.S. international transactions supply reserves to other countries by adding to their dollar holdings.

The occasion for Mr. Dillon's testimony today was consideration by the committee of legislation authorizing the United States to accept a 25-percent increase in its quota in the International Monetary Fund, along with a general increase of the same amount by the other members.

RAYBURN HOUSE MEETING

It was the first meeting of the committee in its new and impressive hearing room in the recently opened $100 million Rayburn House Office Building.

That additional costs on the building—it has been called the most expensive in the history of the world—were still being incurred was made clear by pounding of carpenters on the roof that frequently interrupted Mr. Dillon's testimony and brought forth quips by the committee members.

Representative WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, in a reference to recent U.S. gold losses, said he thought the pounding must be by Frenchmen.

The questioning was generally friendly, and the committee is expected to approve the legislation.

ON QUOTA INCREASES

Mr. Dillon rejected suggestions that the European countries had not contributed sufficiently to the fund-quota increases, though he agreed that the United States would have welcomed extra quota increases by countries such as France that declined to accept them.

Mr. Dillon emphasized that world reserves were "adequate at the present time," especially if augmented by the newly enlarged credit facilities of the fund.

When the United States "gets into balance," he added, the nations "will need to consider whether some other form of reserve asset than the dollar will be needed."

He said, however, he did not think a decision would be required "until we have been in balance for a year or two or three—until we can see the effect of our being in balance."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 18, 1965]

REVERSING THE OUTFLOW

Although one must be cautious in interpreting evidence after only 1 month, it would appear that the administration's program for eliminating the balance-of-payments deficit is working very well, perhaps too well for the comfort of those Europeans who never hesitate to excoriate this country for its profligate ways.

Writing from Paris, Bernard D. Nossiter reports the Commerce Department and Federal Reserve Board programs which have been set up to stanch the outflow of dollars are beginning to pinch like a tight shoe. There has been a sharp increase in the Eurodollar rate—the interest rate on dollars borrowed in Europe—and concern in the European financial press lest a reversal of the dollar outflow precipitate a deflation.

While this country is still some distance from the goal of eliminating its payments deficit, European fears of deflation are well founded if somewhat premature. In addition to the upward pressure on interest rates, a reversal of the dollar outflow will reduce the volume of capital investment in Europe and inhibit the growth of international liquidity, the monetary reserves that are essential to expansion of world trade.

The dangers inherent in the elimination of the U.S. payments deficit can be averted through the creation of a new international monetary unit, a substitute for dollars and gold in the reserve coffers of trading nations. But the basis for an agreement on international monetary reform has not been achieved, and until it is Europe will suffer from the disciplinary actions that it urged upon the United States.

CONGRESS SHOULD BACK BAIL REFORMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I was most honored to cosponsor S. 646, S. 647, S. 648, and S. 1357, bills to modernize and reform an unfair bail system at the Federal level. I have received encouraging support for my position in this matter; and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune be reprinted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

CONGRESS SHOULD BACK BAIL REFORMS

National efforts to reform bail systems deserve encouragement from Congress this year when it considers procedures in Federal courts.

Under the American system of law, the only reason for bail is to secure the presence of an accused person at trial. Yet studies have shown that freedom between the time of arrest and trial too often is determined by financial ability, and that high bail is sometimes used to keep defendants in custody.

These procedures have been denounced by the Department of Justice, by the National Conference on Bail and Criminal Justice in Washington last May and by the results of such experiments as the Manhattan Bail Project in New York. In its first 3 years, that project released 2,195 selected defendants solely on their promises to return for trial, and only 15 failed to do so. The rate of default for those freed on bail was three times as great.

That study and those being carried on in at least 10 other cities indicate that consideration of community ties—rather than just financial ability—might release perhaps half of all criminal defendants with little or no bail and at no greater risk than in the present system. At the same time, poor defendants would not be dependent on the whims of professional bondsmen for freedom.

Three bills already have been introduced in the Senate and House to change present procedures, and an omnibus bill supported by the Department of Justice and the White House is expected next month. In addition to modernizing an unfair system at the Federal level, passage of one of these measures would be a clear invitation to States and cities to do the same.

JOB CORPS LEADERS HANDLE BOYS OF ALL BACKGROUNDS AND PROBLEMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the war on poverty has enlisted many talented youth leaders to guide and harness the restless energies of young men out of school and out of work.

The Washington Daily News has performed a splendid service by sending its reporter, Samuel Stafford, to the Job Corps camp at Catoctin, Md. His three-part series of articles tells how Troy Weaver, a 34-year-old camp counselor who once played with the Harlem Globetrotters, has managed to deal with the fears and hopes of young boys who recently have arrived at this youth conservation camp near Washington, D.C.

I am sure that the war on poverty will enlist many fine young men like Troy Weaver. His experiences illustrate that it is possible to inspire despondent young boys to better themselves.

The State of Minnesota is proud of the pioneering efforts of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and my colleague in the other body, JOHN BLATNIK. For years, they urged Congress to launch a youth conservation corps. This program will not overnight undo the damage which poverty and lack of opportunity have done to thousands of young people. It will, however, make it possible for what good there is in every person to have a chance.

Last year, it was cynically said that it would be cheaper to send poor boys to Harvard than to send them to Job Corps camps. It is obvious, however, that boys with medical problems, reading difficulties, and lack of motivation to stay in school are poor candidates for Harvard. The early successes of the Job Corps, however small, indicate that the vision of Vice President HUMPHREY and Representative BLATNIK and the many others who encouraged this program was well conceived.

Therefore, I commend to all Senators these articles which appeared in the Washington Daily News; and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

THAT'S ALL WE DO HERE—WORK AND EAT

(By Samuel Stafford)

Troy Weaver jumped out of the yellow bus with the agility of a basketball player and turned to watch his boys debark.

They were a sad-sack lot of teenagers and they knew it. Unskilled, short on schooling, they possessed only the clothes on their backs and a large measure of hope that this at least might be a start to somewhere.

Ten of those who stepped self-consciously off the bus at Camp Catoctin, Md., the Nation's first antipoverty program Job Corps conservation camp, were Negroes, the other 10 white.

Troy Weaver, 34, camp counselor who once played with the Harlem Globetrotters, said,

"C'mon, men, you're Job Corpsmen now * * * Nothin' to be so sad-mouthed about. This is your big chance. Mud? Yeah, we got lots of mud. You boys gonna work, turn that mud into grass * * * When do you eat? Man, that's all we do here, work and eat."

Some of the boys smiled and others made feeble jokes, and Troy Weaver continued to practice his specialty, which is getting along with the kids whom society somehow overlooked.

"See that bulldozer over there? Some of you may be driving it some day. You work hard, you can go all the way."

LONG DAY

That's the way it had been all the way up from Baltimore on the bus.

Talk their language. Kid them, needle them, irritate them, roughhouse with them if they're in the mood. But always listen to them. Be square, never lie, and never lose contact.

For Troy, who used to work with slum street gangs and teenage dope addicts in New York and Cleveland, the day had begun badly. The new boys—some from northern city slums and others from ramshackle Midwest farm villages and hillbilly coal towns—were to assemble in Baltimore, and Troy was to bring them to camp at about 11 a.m.

But two Corps recruits from Connecticut missed connections. And a New Jersey boy somehow got lost en route.

It was nearly 2 p.m. when the bus reached camp. The foul-up threw the schedule 3 hours behind, and created later problems for the staff.

There was a welcoming speech by Al Maxey, the softspoken director of Camp Catoctin who used to be a Yellowstone Park ranger, and then a hurry-up lunch, after which the 20 new Corpsmen assembled in the recreation room.

Troy, in slacks and a campus sweater that buttoned down the front, talked easily to the boys.

"How about some of you new boys stand up and introduce yourselves," he said.

A boy got up and stammered, "I'm Steve * * * I'm Steve Fil * * * Steve * * *." His face reddened. "I'm Steve (long pause) * * * Fil * * * Fil * * * Fillipo, of New Haven."

"Fine, fine," Troy Weaver said. Other recruits introduced themselves.

Troy said, "Now the clothing situation is bad. We got here late and probably can't do much about it today. Each of you was supposed to get a complete duffel bag, pants, shirts, and so on. But they won't be here till later. We expected larger boys than we have."

He and other staff members checked the boys to make sure they'd been issued blankets, pillows, towels and such.

THE FUTURE

Then Troy said conversationally, "There's a wealth of things you can learn to do here to equip yourselves for the future. You can say to yourself, 'What am I now * * * what would I like to be?' and you can fill in with what you need. We give 10 hours a week in the education building in reading, arithmetic, typing and other things you need to get a job.

"We work on the principle that you can do better if you teach yourself * * * and we'll function as guides. We start you just where you are in reading and arithmetic and bring you up.

"You grade yourself. If you cheat, you cheat yourself."

Two or three boys looked puzzled.

Staff members explained that the Corpsmen would be divided each day into three groups: "work details"—carpentry, plumbing, electrical or other craft shops, building fire trails and other chores—counseling and educational sessions.

"I'd like you to think of this as a little city," Troy said. "It may sound bad to you, but somebody has to collect garbage. We need a mailman. Somebody has to put up the flag."

FIRST LETTERS

He urged the boys to write home after supper.

"Write, 'Dear Mom, Dear Sweetheart, Dear Sugarpie,'" he said. "I at least got to Catoctin. I think it's great. Or 'I think it's the worst place in the world.' Anything you want."

"Where do you get stamps?" a farm boy asked shyly. Another boy wanted to know where to get a lock. The questions were answered.

Troy dropped naturally into the role of older brother.

"You want to say to hell with it all," he said casually, "you got problems with your girl, you come to old Troy."

He talked about the Boys' Council, formed the night before by corpsmen who had arrived earlier, about off-hours trips to nearby towns to see basketball games or movies, and plans for building a ball field come spring.

"It's a good place," he said. "Maybe you think, 'I failed in school,' but there are no failures here."

HOME

The new corpsmen were told they could smoke anywhere in camp, but were expected to empty any dirty ashtrays they saw.

"We'd like each boy to think of this as his home," Troy said.

"Can your family come and visit you?" a boy asked.

"Sure, I don't see why not." Troy asked whether anybody had any gripes, and a tall Negro boy rose and said, "I'm disappointed. I thought once I got down here in this no-man's land, I could pull down a broken heap and fix it up."

Troy thought about this.

"Well, of course, under Job Corps rules, no cars are allowed at the camp," he said.

"I mean just fix it up so when I leave in 2 years I'll have a heap."

"Maybe that's not a bad idea," Troy said. "You're among the first Job Corpsmen in the country. If there's going to be any changes in the program, you'll help make them."

Another boy said, "If your wife's having a baby, can you go home?" (Very few of the boys are married.)

Troy laughed. "I'd like to see anybody keep me here if my wife was having a baby," he said.

"What about girls?"

"We're going to try to work up some social entertainment—and that means boy meets girl."

ALLOWANCE

Teachers Maurice Robinson and Warner Cheeks and Work Leader Jim Troxell explained other details of the program. The corpsmen were told they would get $30 spending money to start with, and a lump sum of $75 for "dressup clothes."

They will be credited with $50 a month, and if they send half of this home each month, the Government will match it with another $25.

"I think it's pretty nice here," a boy named Herman volunteered.

When the orientation program was over, the boys adjourned to play ping pong and cards and listen to records. Some of the strangeness was beginning to wear off.

After supper, Troy flopped wearily on his bed.

"Whew," he said. "Rough day."

But his troubles were only beginning.

A young man entered the room and announced: "One of the new boys says he's going home."

And Troy went off to see what he could do.

A LOST BOY IS FOUND AND LOST AGAIN

(By Samuel Stafford)

Troy Weaver, the counselor at Camp Catoctin, Md., the Nation's first Job Corps conservation camp for school dropouts lay on his bunk, eyes half closed, listening to the confusing blend of laughter, the ticktock of ping pong balls and driving rock and roll from the recreation room next door. It had been a hard day.

Some of the new arrivals had gotten in late, due to a mixup, and all of the boys were far from home, and some seemed bored and edgy.

Troy listened for signs of trouble, and it came in a rush. A boy burst into Troy's room.

"Troy," he said, "one of the guys who came today wants to leave. He said he hates it here."

HELP

The messenger was one of the old boys from a group of Job Corpsmen who had come to Camp Catoctin a few weeks earlier.

Troy sighed and got to his feet. "Looks like one of those days," he said, and followed the boy through the crowded recreation room and out the front door.

Another boy materialized out of the darkness. His name was Perryman and he was one of the old boys, too.

Perryman nodded at a thin blond, pimply-faced boy beside him, and told Troy Weaver: "He says he is going to catch the next bus out. Maybe I can help with the problem."

Troy said, "Thanks. I will let you know what happens."

INTRODUCTION

Then he put his arm around the blond boy, and said, "I forgot your name."

"Richard," the boy said. "I come in from New Jersey."

"Oh, you are the fellow who was lost, came by car. Well, you have had a bad day all around, have you not?"

Troy, arm still around Richard, said, "let us talk about it in my office."

They walked through the mud in silence for a few moments, and then Troy asked gently, "What is wrong? You homesick?"

Richard's eyes were nearly hidden under the blond thatch. His hands trembled and his lower lip quivered. He wore a dirty blue windbreaker and tan cotton pants.

"Yeah," he said, "I guess so."

"First time you have been away from home?"

"Yes." Richard looked at the ground.

They neared the door of the education building, and Troy, with the sure instinct of one who has been on many streets before, asked softly, "Who is it you miss?"

"My dog, Cindy," the boy said.

"Just your dog?"

"No, my brudder, too. I thought my brudder was coming along with me. My brudder got turned down. He always lost out on every Government thing he ever tried for."

WHEN?

They entered Troy's cubbyhole counseling office. Richard, tears welling up, dropped into a chair. Troy sat on the edge of his cluttered desk.

"When did you decide to leave, Richard?" Troy asked, gazing into space.

"The minute I walked into this place." Richard's jaw worked violently. "My fodder and I thought I was going to Oregon. I didn't know I was coming here till I got on my way."

Troy laughed, but not harshly. "Be glad you're in Maryland," he said. "It's a lot longer trip home from Oregon."

A trace of a smile crossed the boy's face before he allowed himself to become miserable again.

INTERESTS?

Troy gazed at the ceiling, scratched his head, yawned, and casually asked, "What is it you like to do?"

The forlorn lump of a boy in the chair stirred uneasily. "Well," he murmured, "play the guitar, I guess."

"You play the guitar we have in the rec room?"

"I plunked it a little."

"You met your roommate yet?"

"No."

Troy said, "You haven't even been in your room yet. Have you seen any of our buildings?"

"Well * * * no." The boy's hands still trembled.

"My point," said Troy, "is that you don't even know what we do or the programs we have and you want to leave. You think that's right?"

"I guess not," Richard said hesitantly.

"Have any idea what you want to learn?"

"Well, I thought I might want to drive a bulldozer."

A SPARK

Troy's feigned torpor vanished.

"Well, didn't you see those bulldozers lined up out front when you came in?" he said. "You can learn to run one here. But there's other things to do, too. You make your bed at home?"

"I don't sleep on a bed * * * I sleep on a couch."

"Live in a big house?"

"No, a little house."

"What's your father do?"

"He paints boats." Richard wiped at his tears with a grimy sleeve.

SCHOOL

Troy let the silence gather. Then he asked, "When did you quit school?"

"Eighth grade."

"Why?"

Richard made a face and shrugged. "I didnt like it. They call you names and things. I told 'em I was quitting and I did."

"You like anything in school?"

Another shrug. "Spelling and reading was okay, but I hate arithmetic."

Troy informed him that the would have to learn arithmetic to handle bulldozer work.

"I dunno," Richard said. "I just don't like it here. My folks told me if I wanted to come home, just come home. I guess my mind's made up."

HIS CHOICE

Troy Weaver said, "I'm not going to try to talk you into staying. That's up to you. All I want you to do is give us a chance."

Silence from Richard.

"What else do you like to do?" Troy asked. "You like movies?"

"Not very good. Maybe monster movies. I just like to be alone."

"Why?" (Gently.)

"I don't know", Richard said, biting his lip.

Troy said, "Maybe I can fix it up for you to get a roommate. Maybe that boy, Perryman, who wanted to help you * * *"

"I don't care," Richard said with a shrug. "I mean, I'm not going to start a fight with him or anything, but I don't care."

PRECURSOR

"You know, a week ago Perryman wanted to leave," Troy said.

"Yeah but somebody stopped him outside the gate and made him get into a truck."

Troy grinned. "That was me," he said. "Only I didn't tell him to get into the truck. I just talked to him and afterward he got in. It was his decision. You like girls?"

"No."

"Well, that's up to you, too, but you can't just keep leaving everything that doesn't work out for you." "You know, Richard, some day you're going to have to leave your father, mother, and dog, and you have to get ready for it. You're almost a man. We can help you get a [redacted] and other things."

SPORTS?

A long pause. Then, "Do you like sports?"

"No. Just weight lifting and karate."

"Well," Troy said, "we've got a Marine sergeant here who knows weight lifting, and we got a gym. Didn't you see that yet, did you? Didn't give us a chance."

Richard smiled sheepishly.

Troy got up and left the office to handle another problem, and when he returned, he said, "Well, what do you think?"

Richard, smiling faintly, said, "I guess maybe I'll stick it out. * * *" But seconds later, he shook his head and muttered, "No, my mind's made up. I was stupid to think I'd like it here. I'm going."

Troy faced the boy and said, "Nobody makes you stay or go. Nobody pushes you here. We all get lonely. I'd like to see my wife and kids down in Washington, but I'm lucky to see them once a week. Maybe I can move them up sometime. I came up to Catoctin because I believe in it and I like the work. I like the kids—and, Richard, I want you to consider me a friend."

He left it at that. But later he and Maurice Robinson, a teacher at the camp, decided to have Billy Tucker, a small, talkative 16-year-old Virginia country boy, room with Richard and try to cheer him up. But 2 hours after this decision was made Billy announced in the recreation room that he, too, was going home.

Two Negro boys promptly talked him out of it. "The food's too good," one of them said.

Later that evening, Troy look Richard along when he drove to nearly Thurmont for cigarettes. Troy gave the boy half a dollar, which Richard refused at first, but finally he accepted it and bought some cigarettes, too.

A dispute was brewing in the recreation room when they got back to camp.

James Blackmon, who wears a pearl in his right ear—a badge of his old New Haven, Conn., club—and James Truesdale, nicknamed "Moose," of Camden, S.C., had disagreed on the choice of TV programs, and the argument was escalating.

Troy, Maurice, and other staff members soothed the combatants and Blackmon and Moose were told to straighten up by the Boys' Council, formed mainly of "old boys" at camp.

"We never had trouble like this, and we don't need it," said Ray Martin, 17, son of a Kentucky coal miner. "We got a big chance to make good here, and we don't want to spoil it."

EXIT RICHARD

Troy flopped wearily on his bunk. It had been a tough day.

"When they get a full crew of 100 corpsmen here," he said, "I'll be afraid to leave at all."

But then he said, "Funny thing—after they've been here about 3 days, they settle down and they're OK.

As for Richard, he hung around camp for 2 days, brooding, and then he joined up with two other homesick boys and left for home.

"Those guys are crazy," said a boy who watched them go. "Government give 'em a good chance and they throw it away."

A DAY WITH SOME BOYS JUST BEGINNING

(By Samuel Stafford)

Recently, I conducted a highly-unscientific attitude survey among some adults I had reason to believe were broadminded.

"Give me," I said, "your impressions of a typical school dropout."

Their collective portrait showed a hard, delinquent kid, too dumb or too lazy to make it in school, who therefore spent much time in the streets, preoccupied with girls and other mischief.

But when I stayed at Camp Catoctin in the mountains of Maryland, the Nation's first Federal Job Corps rural camp for dropouts, this boy was nowhere to be seen.

Instead, I found an assortment of boys—Negroes and whites, some from big cities, North and South, and some from Midwest farms or Appalachia's dreary mining towns—most of them shy, meek, uncertain, suggestible, vulnerable, and anxious to please.

"We have no kids with bad records here," said Al Maxey, Catoctin's director, "although a few have had scrapes with police. We're not geared to handle juvenile delinquents."

And a Catoctin staff member said, "One thing I've noticed. The kids here aren't nearly as sophisticated as juvenile delinquents I've known."

Camp Catoctin, only a mile from Camp David, the Presidential retreat, and 61 other conservation camps throughout the country, eventually will house 100 boys each. Other Corpsmen will learn trades in larger urban camps.

COUNTRY BOY

Billy Tucker, a pint-sized, talkative 16-year-old from a Wise County, Va., town so small "you can spit from one end to the other," dropped out of school in the seventh grade. He has eight brothers and sisters, and his father, he says, "hasn't worked 7–8 years, ever since he got mashed up in a coal mine."

Billy helped out some by "choppin' wood."

He has few interests. "I only like to swim and fish," he said. He is crazy about the food at Catoctin. "Best butter I ever ate," he said wolfing down two platesful.

CITY FELLOWS

Henry Lee Epps, Jr., 17, a Negro from a broken home in Baltimore, is one of the original 9 boys who opened the camp 2 months ago. He is expected to ease the way for succeeding waves of Catoctin Corpsmen.

Henry is an enthusiast.

"Why'd I join up?" he asked. "To get to be somebody, that's why. My grandma saw about the Job Corps in the paper and told me about it. I like it here."

Bill Keefer, 20, comes from Uniontown, Pa., a town whose future often has looked as dark as its old buildings.

"My dad worked the Buckeye and other coal mines," Bill said. "Then, about 6 years ago, there was an explosion. His insides were messed up and he had to go on relief. Eight kids in my family. I quit in eighth grade. I wasn't burning up the course and my family needed the money I earned. It's good here. I want to get more schooling, maybe learn to run heavy equipment."

THE MIDWEST

When I first met Bill, he was showing Herman Singleton, 19, a Galesburg, Ill., farm boy, how to iron his pants.

"My dad," Herman said solemnly, "got killed when I was a baby. Grindstone flew apart and hit him."

Herman has eight brothers and a sister.

"I quit after tenth grade," he said without bitterness. "I couldn't get along. It was just a little bit too hard. I farmed, picked corn, did baling, and disking. I read about the Job Corps in the paper and took the tests. I think it's pretty nice here. I want to get my high school diploma and learn mechanics on foreign cars."

KENTUCKY BOY

When I first met Ray Martin, 18, he was earnestly listening to Herbert Grimm, foreman of camp roads and trails, who was operating a hugh front-end loader. Ray had

seen him plowing through the dirt, and asked him to show him how it worked. Mr. Grimm had obliged.

Afterward, Ray said, "I want to learn everything around here. Mostly, I'm interested in mechanics."

Ray comes from Whitesburg, Ky., and has 11 brothers and sisters. He dropped out of school in the seventh grade. ("I couldn't hack it, things were tight, I had to go to work.") He ran a motor in a coal mine and later read about the Job Corps, and signed up.

Like several of the original nine boys who opened the camp, Ray has blossomed into a camp leader and a moving force in the newly organized Boys' Council—an important liaison between corpsmen and staff.

How did his family like the idea of his joining the Job Corps?

"Liked it real smart," Ray said.

I discovered Richard Tyndall, 17, a small, blond boy from Dillon, S.C., doing pushups in the latrine.

"Gained 5 pounds doing these exercises," he explained. "Come around a year from now and see me. I'll be like Atlas. The Government's doing a good thing for us here."

Gregory Ratliffe, of Baltimore, a remarkably thin boy, was filling cans with cement to make his own barbells.

"When I quit school, man, I wasn't never goin' back," he told me. "Got a job as busboy, laborer, all that. Goin' nowhere. Then I saw the Job Corps thing."

REVEILLE

Organized exercise at the camp has typical hurdles to overcome.

First Sgt. Samuel Griffiths, a muscular health food addict on loan from the Marine Corps, directs the physical education program.

One recent morning, he sat in the recreation room, waiting for the boys to fall out for calisthenics at 6 o'clock. A few boys straggled into the room. Clearly the Sarge was disappointed.

"Maybe it's the weather," he ventured. "A little drizzly out."

Later, when no new exercisers appeared, he said, "Can't understand it. Usually, we get a full turnout."

So a call was put out for Troy Weaver, Catoctin's chief counselor and a former Harlem Globetrotter basketball player. Troy rampaged through the barracks, pounding on doors, deftly turning aside excuses from his sleeping charges.

"Calisthenics, men," he boomed. "How come you old men ain't out of the sack yet? Bad example to the new men. Let's go, let's go."

A colored boy named Moose said, "I ain't goin' to take no exercises, got a bad foot."

Troy said, "Get a nurse's certificate," and kept pounding on doors.

The barracks soon emptied and Moose was left alone. Reluctantly, he joined in calisthenics, a victim of group pressure.

CONFIDENCE

At breakfast, the Sarge ladled protein powder ("It makes you feel tiptop") out of a can to fellow staffers who regard this food-and-fresh-air fanatic with amusement, awe and respect. They know his value in building morale among the boys.

"He makes the corpsmen feel like tigers," a colleague said.

An attempt to show the boys what life can offer—and how they can get it—is apparent in all the staff work.

Troy is giving an attitude test to new recruits.

"What this place really means is that if the other guy can do it, you can do it too," he says. "You want a swimming pool, a maid, a big house in the country, breakfast in bed?"

There is a chorus of "Yeses."

"Well," Troy says, "You can have these things. But it takes money. You have to work to get the money. And you have to have a job to earn money. And you have to learn to get a job."

TRADES

The boys at Catoctin will learn such crafts as auto mechanics, plumbing, heavy equipment operation, and forestry, while maintaining the campsite and refurbishing nearby parks.

A few critics have suggested that the Job Corps is designed to be a "showpiece" in the antipoverty war. They say only the "good kids" are admitted—that the program will not touch many delinquent boys who need it most. Where, such critics ask, does one draw the line in accepting or rejecting a boy on the basis of his police record? Do you accept a boy with a school truancy record, but turn an auto thief down?

What will happen to all the bitter rejects among hopeful applicants?

A REPLY

A national antipoverty office official said, "This kind of carping is ridiculous. The national office does not do the screening. Local offices—like the United Planning Organization here in Washington—do it with the help of social workers, the boy's church if he has one, juvenile authorities, school officials, and police.

"If all of these people decide a boy probably will benefit from the program, then he is a good bet to be accepted. Anyhow, only about 1,000 or so have been screened throughout the country out of more than 125,000 applicants, so how can anybody criticize the screening process so early in the game?"

That mistakes will be made is conceded. To restore some measure of hope to a boy in peril of losing a race he never ran is a delicate chance and altogether exciting undertaking.

Al Maxey, the former Yellowstone National Park ranger who now directs Camp Catoctin, puts it like this:

"It is like being the first plow that goes through the virgin snow at Yellowstone. That is a lot more fun than being one of the 10 or 12 plows that follow along behind."

MINNESOTA'S PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION YEAR

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the year 1965 was designated by the United Nations and by a proclamation by President Johnson as International Cooperation Year. The President has called on all Government agencies, his executive staff, and other citizens to do everything in their power to encourage and develop projects that will prove to the world that we believe peace and good will throughout the globe can be maintained through cooperation.

One of the first of such projects developed after months of negotiations between Midland Cooperatives, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., and the Dominican Government, and resulted in a refinery project that has matured to the point where formal construction activities will start within a very short time.

Midland Cooperatives, Inc., is a large regional cooperative, with headquarters in Minneapolis, and several hundred member cooperatives scattered through several Midwestern States. I am well acquainted with Midland's management and its board of directors. All are to be commended for the initiative and courage they have shown in successfully negotiating an oil-refinery concession with the Dominican Government. The covering agreement reflects the kind of cooperation that has played such an important role in the development of our own country, and I am confident that it will be the foundation of similar results with the people of the Dominican Republic.

As a part of the agreement, Midland is setting aside a sum in excess of $500,000 a year that will be used to develop and promote the cooperative movement at all levels in the Dominican Republic. Furthermore, Midland is lending the Dominican Cooperative Institute the necessary equity capital whereby the latter can be a full and equal partner in the ownership of the refinery. It is the plan of Midland to train Dominican nationals in its refinery at Cushing, Okla., so that the maximum number of Dominican citizens will participate in the operation of the new facility. At all levels of the Dominican society, American cooperatives are already showing an interest and a direct participation.

Murray D. Lincoln, who for many decades has been a leader in the cooperative movement in the United States, is to be commended for the initiative he showed. Midland's general manager, A. J. Smaby, and his associates, Milton B. Zeddies and J. A. Bierbaum, did an outstanding job in handling the final negotiations for the refinery agreement. Mr. Smaby has for many years been an active participant in the international cooperative field, and is chairman of the board of the International Cooperative Development Association, a member of the board of the International Cooperative Development Fund, a member of the central committee of the International Cooperative Alliance, a member of the Inter-American Cooperative Finance Institute, and a member of the board of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

Dr. Donald Reid Cabral, president of the Triumvirate of the Dominican Government, and his associates, are also to be commended, because any decision such as the one involved in this project touches upon every political and economic facet of the Dominican Republic's national life.

Recently, the Export-Import Bank approved a $5.5 million loan to assist in the financing of the construction of this refinery. This action reflects most favorably on the judgment and initiative displayed by Harold Linder, president of the Bank, and his staff.

I think it of importance that recognition be given this major breakthrough by American and Dominican cooperatives, since it will not only benefit our people, but also will be an example to others of what can be accomplished by using the cooperative approach.

It is fitting that this event happened in the year proclaimed by our President as International Cooperative Year. We in Minnesota are proud that so many Minnesotans played vital and active roles in this unprecedented venture.

AUTOMOBILE-TIRE SAFETY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Federal Trade Commission recently held 3

days of public hearings on the serious problem of automobile-tire safety. The transcript of these hearings runs in the neighborhood of 800 typewritten pages.

I testified at these hearings; but I was unable to sit through all 3 days and to listen to all of the testimony. I have assigned a member of my staff, however, to review the entire transcript. Several newspaper and wire-service reporters who also have heard about the transcript have contacted me recently, in an attempt to obtain copies of the transcript. They stated that they considered some of the testimony contained therein to be "explosive" and of wide public interest. The transcript contains testimony from acknowledged experts in the field of tire manufacture, which indicates a very alarming situation in the industry. I cannot undertake at this time to give a complete account or summary of the testimony in the transcript, but it includes matters such as these:

Many new cars come equipped with tires which are not adequate, even for normal use.

Six-passenger sedans with big trunks are tested for tire purposes with only three passengers and no luggage.

Some compact station wagons require eight-ply tires; yet many firms are shifting from four-ply to two-ply tires.

Tire sizes stamped on the tires do not tell the actual size, and were never intended to do so.

Ply-rating labels have "no understandable meaning" within the industry.

The automobile and tire industries say that choosing the right tire is up to the motorist. Yet there is no way the motorist can make this choice.

The American public and the press should have this full transcript laid before them. It indicates that untold thousands of people are buying fine new cars, loading them up with children and baggage, and setting out across the country in the belief that they are perfectly safe. Actually, many of them are sitting on a time bomb.

My files are filled with letters from people who have had tires fail on practically new cars in perfectly normal use. Now this hearing record explains how such things happen, and raises the question of how many of our 47,000 highway deaths last year were caused by tire failure.

I have written to the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Paul Rand Dixon, asking the FTC to publish the full transcript. I also have written to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], as chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee and as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, suggesting that Congress should be willing to pay the cost of publishing such an important hearing record if the FTC is unable to do so.

In the transcript of the FTC hearings, the president of the Rubber Manufacturers Association testified that the selection of the proper tire for a specific car is the responsibility of the individual motorist. Yet, this same official testified that the public was wrong in thinking that the tire size stamped on the tire, such as 7.50x14, was actually a measurement of the tire size.

The Rubber Manufacturers Association president testified:

> The tire name size is molded on the product as a nominal designation for purposes of easy identification by the customer. It is not intended to precisely define the physical dimensions of the tire or the wheel in which it is mounted.

Mr. President, I consider such a statement absolutely unbelievable. In one breath, they say the motorist must pick the right tire for his car; in the next breath, they say the labels on the tires do not mean anything. How in the world is the motorist supposed to pick the right tire?

The FTC Commissioners themselves were shocked at some of the testimony on how the automobile and tire industry fitted the tires to new cars. For instance, one of the Commissioners asked a tire-industry official:

> You say that your test for a six-passenger sedan, which has a big trunk for luggage and so on, is based on the assumption that there will be only three passengers and no baggage?

The tire industry spokesman replied: "Yes, sir."

Another top tire industry official testified that some compact station wagons should have 8-ply tires to carry the loads which they could accommodate.

An FTC Commissioner replied:

> A compact station wagon doesn't come with an 8-ply standard tire as standard equipment.

A tire industry witness replied:

> There is an option in almost all instances, I think you will find, which is recommended in the car-care manual, perhaps, of the company.

Mr. President, this is shocking testimony by itself; but it is made far worse when we read, later on, that the president of the National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association testified:

> The word "ply-rating" has no understandable meaning any more.

They tell the motorist that he must study the car-care manual, to know the number of plies his tires need; and then they tell him that the "ply-rating" labels on the tires have no understandable meaning.

A reading of the transcript reveals that even the tire and automobile industry spokesmen are anxious to have reforms made. There is no need to berate these witnesses; they are telling the truth about a scandalous situation. The responsibility belongs to Congress and to the American public. We should make this 800-page indictment available, and then should move promptly to correct the inexcusable conditions which it exposes.

THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH HOSPITAL AT LEXINGTON, KY.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, this is a brief report, for the benefit of Senators, concerning my visit over the weekend of February 27, to the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital at Lexington, Ky., as a member of the Penitentiaries Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. The hospital, as Senators are aware, was opened in 1935, for the treatment of narcotic addicts.

The Lexington hospital and its program are discussed in the second of two well-researched and well-written articles in the Life magazine issues for February 26 and March 5, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the article referring to the Lexington hospital be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the Lexington hospital has approximately 1,000 patients, about two-thirds of whom are Federal prisoners under sentence, and the remainder are largely addicts who have voluntarily committed themselves for treatment. Regardless of whether they are prisoners or voluntary patients, their course of treatment at the hospital is largely the same. They are first taken off drugs, usually heroin, given a period of convalescence, and then subjected to an individually prescribed treatment program.

During my visit, I stopped in the ward in which a number of patients were being withdrawn from drugs; and my observations there were almost in direct contrast with the dramatizations of such situations that one often sees on television. The patients were not sweating, writhing, or experiencing much obvious discomfort or suffering. They were sitting there, lying there, or walking around, much as would patients in any other type of hospital.

I learned from Dr. Robert W. Rasor, the medical officer in charge of the hospital, who was my guide, that very few addicts these days experience severe withdrawal symptoms. By the time heroin gets to the addict, it has been cut so many times that not much of the original substance remains. This development is another indication that addiction is more a psychological than a physical problem. The easiest part of the treatment process is to relieve the addict's physical dependence on drugs; the hardest part is to equip him psychologically to resist returning to drugs.

I need not discuss in this report the nature and prevalence of addiction. That has been done quite thoroughly and expertly in the Life articles. I was interested to learn, however, that over a recent 5-year period, Lexington received only 7 patients from North Dakota.

In contrast, the hospital received approximately 7,000 from New York. The hospital statistics suggest that narcotics problem is largely concentrated in the cities of New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Detroit.

While, as I have pointed out, about two-thirds of the patients are sentenced Federal prisoners, the admission figures show a markedly different ratio. Of some 2,500 admissions during 1965, nearly 2,000 were voluntary. The high turnover among the voluntary patients is attributable to the fact that the hospital cannot require them to remain for a stipulated period of treatment. One-fourth of the voluntary patients leave the hospital, against medical advice,

within 9 days, and the majority within 90 days.

Needless to say, virtually all persons who leave against medical advice revert immediately to the use of drugs.

I have heard various estimates, ranging up to about 95 percent, of the rate of relapse among addicts who have been to Lexington. Dr. Rasor advises me, however, that there are no really valid statistics on this score. A number of circumstances, including the legal protection given Lexington patients as to their identity as addicts, have handicapped research in this respect. The limited followup that has been done suggests that, while there may be a high rate of relapse, most addicts eventually abandon the use of drugs as they reach the middle and late thirties and the early forties. Addiction is chiefly a disease of young people. A similar pattern, I am told, is also characteristic of criminal behavior.

The rehabilitation program is psychiatrically oriented. The hospital has a dozen psychiatrists and a half-dozen psychologists, among whom there is approximately a 90-percent turnover every 2 years, and a number of social workers who are also psychiatrically trained. Several rooms have been set aside for group therapy sessions led by the professional personnel. As a member of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice, which currently is inquiring into the use of surveillance devices, I was interested to note that the rooms were equipped with one-way windows. The nature of the windows is known to the addict patients, and they are intended to facilitate the training of professional personnel for work with addicts. Many group therapy sessions are also recorded, and the discussions are later analyzed for research training, and treatment purposes.

The hospital gives addicts a chance to acquire more socially constructive habits. They are exposed to healthy forms of recreation; and the hospital is particularly well equipped in this respect. It has excellent facilities for athletic activities, handicrafts, sedentary avocations, and even a theater that is better than any I have seen so far in other Federal institutions.

The patients are also assigned to a wide range of occupational fields, not only for the purpose of teaching them good work habits and skills, but also to put them in situations where they must learn to get along with coworkers, instructors, and supervisors. In addition to the usual trades and occupational fields represented in the operation of the hospital, there is a furniture factory, a needle-trade factory, and a print shop. The output of the three industries is sold to other Government agencies, chiefly the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The hospital also has an attractive chapel, and the patients are given every encouragement to participate in religious activities and to seek religious counseling.

The rehabilitation program at Lexington has many strengths. Its chief weakness is that there is very little or no follow-up supervision or assistance when the patients are released to their communities. Too often they return to exactly the same sort of circumstances and problems that led to their addiction in the first place. Their return to drugs under these circumstances is predictable.

The work of the Addiction Research Center at Lexington, which is supported by the National Institute of Mental Health, and is headed by Dr. William R. Martin, is particularly significant. The Center was established at the same time as the hospital, with the mission of investigating the cause, treatment, and prevention of drug addiction. It has a staff of approximately 50 people, and a budget of about $500,000 annually.

Among other things, the Center tries to detect the abuse potentialities of new drugs being considered for the market; and its work has been a tremendous public service. It has successfully kept off the market a number of drugs with an addicting potential. In this phase of its work, the Center serves as a clinical testing center for the Drug Addiction Committee, of the National Research Council; and for the Expert Committee on Habit-Forming Drugs, of the United Nations.

The Center's researches associated with the various psychological, physical, biochemical, and emotional reactions that follow the administration of drugs have led to the experimental development of what are termed narcotic antagonist drugs. The Center has tentatively identified at least one drug that may someday be useful in the treatment of addicts. When administered to an addict once a day, it would prevent the various effects of any narcotic that he might take, including the euphoria and the physical dependence. When administered after a narcotic had been taken, it would reverse the effects of the narcotic, and would bring on withdrawal symptoms. In the first instance, the drug would prevent the readdiction of the treated addict. In the second, it would help in detecting the treated addict who had reverted to the use of drugs.

The Center has also done some work on the development of a nonaddicting painkiller. The importance of this work is dramatized by the fact that, among occupational groups, doctors and nurses have the highest rates of addiction. The hospital almost always has a number of these medical people as patients. Their presence underscores the fact that education—"knowing better"—is not necessarily the answer to the drug problem.

I was informed that the Center has begun to do some work on alcohol addiction. It was in our discussion on alcoholism that the problem of narcotics addiction began to appear in its proper perspective. In the United States, approximately 5 million people habitually use alcohol to excess. Several hundred thousand are as thoroughly addicted to alcohol as is any addict to heroin. In contrast, the best available estimate concerning the prevalence of drug addiction numbers the victims at about 60,000.

As a result of my visit to Lexington, I would urge upon the appropriate agencies of the executive branch and the appropriate committees of Congress the development of legislation which would accomplish these objectives:

First. A compulsory civil commitment procedure which would prevent the departure of the voluntary patients from the narcotic hospitals until they have completed the full course of rehabilitative treatment prescribed by the medical and psychiatric staff.

Second. More flexibility in the sentences given to Federal offenders who are narcotic addicts, in order that they may be released to the community on trial when the hospital professional staff feels that they are ready.

Third. A more adequate system of community supervision and followup for both voluntary patients and released prisoners, including halfway houses in such communities as Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, and New York City, where the incidence of addiction is high enough that such facilities can be economically warranted.

Fourth. An expansion of the work of the Addiction Research Center at Lexington, particularly including a large-scale study of the problem of alcohol addiction.

Fifth. The development of incentives which will prevent excessive turnover of medical and psychiatric personnel in the U.S. Public Health Service. This turnover handicaps the treatment programs both of the narcotic hospitals and of the Federal penal and correctional institutions whose hospitals are staffed by Public Health Service personnel.

Sixth. The Federal control of other drugs with an abuse potential, whose victims cannot be accepted, under current statutes, for treatment at the Lexington and Fort Worth narcotics hospitals.

EXHIBIT 1

HOSPITAL FIGHTS A FRUSTRATING BATTLE

The world's largest, oldest, most prestigious center for treating drug addicts sits atop a hill near Lexington on a thousand acres of Kentucky's finest bluegrass meadowland. It opened 30 years ago as the U.S. Narcotics Farm, but when addicts started writing in to order narcotics, the name was hastily changed to the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital. It has been an off-and-on home for countless addicts, who refer to it simply as "K.Y." Until recently, when a few big cities started putting aside hospital beds for addicts, Lexington and a smaller Public Health Service hospital in Fort Worth, Tex., were just about the only spots in the United States where a junkie could hole up, get off heroin, catch his breath and have a crack at permanently overcoming his addiction.

The scores of addict treatment centers that spread across the country—there are 40 in New York City alone—range from the well-known, multichaptered Synanon (Life, Mar. 9, 1962) to the offices of a few individual physicians with an honest sympathy for addicts. But Lexington still bears the brunt of addiction treatment, taking in 1,900 voluntary patients and 432 Federal prisoners last year (at any one time prisoners, who stay longer, outnumber voluntaries).

Anyone who has never been a voluntary patient before and uses any drug included in a long—but outdated—list set by Federal law may get in simply by showing up at the main gate. Former voluntary patients who seek readmittance must file an application. Unfortunately, some of the more hazardous addicting drugs, like barbiturates and amphetamines, are excluded from the list, and users of them are admitted only if they also

use a listed drug. While a once-in-a-while marihuana smoker can get in, a dangerously addicted barbiturate user is turned away.

Checking into Lexington, an addict finds himself swept up by a system designed to take him off drugs and keep him off. Getting him off is not much of a problem. Because of the high price of heroin on the street, few addicts today can afford enough to give them a severe habit. When they kick the habit, even without assisting medication, they ordinarily experience intense nervousness, runny nose, goose flesh, diarrhea, mild stomach cramps—symptoms familiar to anyone who has fought off a bad case of flu. To relieve discomfort during the first few days of withdrawal, heroin addicts get a periodic swallow of methadone, a synthetic narcotic. Barbiturate addicts get pentobarbital. After a few days, the addict's body has lost its dependence on heroin and needs not drugs but rest and food.

The real battle at K.Y. is not with the addict's body but with his mind. He must be weaned from his emotional craving for drugs. Once off drugs, he is moved to "orientation," where for 3 weeks he is tested and talked to by psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and job trainers. Finally assigned a room in "population," he finds himself with a 30-hour-a-week job or a school program teaching him to be almost anything from a printer or pants presser to a dental assistant.

From here on in, Lexington stops looking like a hospital. The staple medicine is other people. The addict is forced to cope with the staff and other patients, and now he has no drugs to help him escape—as he always has before—the problem of dealing with other people and with himself. Group therapy sessions help him along and, if he needs it, he may get individual therapy from 1 of the hospital's 14 staff psychiatrists.

Treatment does not always go so smoothly. Most patients are big city heroin addicts who, though they come voluntarily to the hospital, may not be really sure they want to make the break. Sometimes they try to smuggle drugs in with them. They show a resourcefulness and ingenuity picked up in years of street living. Addicts have hidden heroin under their toenails, taped to the bottom of their feet, stuffed behind dental plates, sprinkled through their hair. To inject drugs smuggled into the hospital, patients have fashioned syringes from plastic bottles and needles from ballpoint pens. Some years ago, the entire hospital system appeared outsmarted when patients suddenly started showing up high on heroin. Security men sitting in the admitting rooms could not detect the flaw, and the heroin kept coming in. Finally a helpful addict sent a hospital official a copy of a leaflet he had bought on a Harlem street corner for $1. It was titled "How To Smuggle Drugs Into Lexington": simply, go in with a couple of bags of heroin in your hand, ask for a paper towel to wipe your nose, crumple the bags into the towel and hold on to it—nobody will suspect the towel because a hospital official gave it to you in the first place. And it worked.

Dr. Frederick B. Glaser, the psychiatrist who appears on the preceding pages, considered the two young sisters to be among his most hopeful patients. "You talk to those girls," he said before they had returned to New York, "and your heart goes out to them. They're ingenuous, not at all hardened. Both girls break a lot of rules, but you hate to punish them because they're so childish and they break them so innocently. One day they don't go to work and you tell them they have to, and they ask innocently, 'Why?' They're so childish that someone suggested that when they do something wrong, we ought to just spank them. If I were in New York and could see these girls as outpatients I think I could help them."

When they did get back to New York, the younger sister moved in with her mother and the older one went back with a 60-year-old bookie who had kept her before she went to Lexington. They live only a few blocks from a corner—96th Street and Broadway—popular with junkies and pushers. "I try to stay out of the neighborhood," the older sister said, looking up toward the drug-infested corner, "but it's tough. The other junkies ride you when you're off the stuff. I guess they want to get you back on so they won't feel put down by you. I really want to stop drugs. At K.Y. I saw these junkies with scars and abscesses and all that. That's not for me. I want to stop." But a week after leaving Lexington, she was back on drugs—and so was her sister.

Doctors at Lexington, though disappointed, were hardly surprised. Very few Lexington patients—probably less than 10 percent—stay off drugs when they get home. Dr. Glaser and the other doctors would seem to have ample reason for feeling that they are fighting a losing battle. But they do not. They are bolstered by one intriguing and extraordinary fact: nearly half the country's addicts are in their twenties, and only 11 percent are over 40. What happens to an addict when he begins to age? Evidently, as he grows older, he also grows up. He matures. His compulsion to avoid the desperate, degraded life of addiction overpowers his compulsion to use drugs.

Many psychiatrists believe that the maturing process can be hastened by hospital therapy, that as the addict experiences drug-free life in a hospital—or perhaps even in a jail—a layer of maturity is laid down within him. Each time his addiction is arrested for a few more weeks or months, the layer thickens. Finally, he outgrows his infantile need for the solace of drugs and gives them up. This theory, combined with the obvious humanitarian necessity of providing some kind of hospital treatment to addicts, is what refutes Lexington's high relapse rate—and keeps its doctors plugging.

Dr. Glaser scratches his head and listens to suggestions and gripes from some addicts in one of the female dormitories (their faces have been retouched). His toughest job in treating patients is getting them to recognize their problems and to attack them without the help of drugs. Many addicts have for so long used drugs to insulate themselves from the world and its anxieties that they cannot recognize a problem when they see it. They reject responsibility for their own lives. Some prisoner patients, upset by the relative freedom and the responsibility it implies, ask to be transferred to conventional prisons where every door is locked and every movement regimented. Teaching all patients to accept responsibility, to recognize their faults and to move ahead into the complicated business of living a drug-free life can take months and years of steady, perceptive, inspired labor.

Almost all the patients' problems have something to do with their families. A young girl received a telegram from her husband telling her that her father had been fighting with him, trying to break up the marriage. He said that if she wasn't home in a week he was going to kill her father or be killed by him. The girl read the telegram and burst into tears.

"Why can't I kick my habit and be happy one time in my life, when I love this man so much. All my father ever did all my life was drink and chase me and make trouble for me. And now I finally find one man worth giving up drugs for and why won't he leave me alone?" Glaser said softly, "I'll arrange for you to make a [redacted] call home. See what you can do to keep from leaving. Maybe your husband sent the telegram in a fit of anger or desperation and things aren't really that bad. Try to stay as long as possible and let us help you."

Another voluntary patient complained that because she had bad teeth no one in her "alley" (dormitory corridor) liked her. She demanded a room in another alley. Glaser explained that rules forbade such a move until she had been in the room for a certain number of weeks.

"Well, I can't stand it there," she cried. "I don't like anyone. They don't like me. I'd rather be on the street than living there. If I stay there, I'll have to have something to calm me down. Else I'll have to go back to the street."

"You'll have to decide what you think is best," Glaser said, and left her to think it over. "Sometimes," he explains, "you have to force patients to face their problems. They'll try anything to make you bend and solve their problems for them. But that's what's been happening all their lives. That's why they're sick and on drugs. You can't let yourself do it."

Another patient told Glaser she went on drugs because she felt guilty about having stolen a wallet from her grandfather when she was 14. She stays on drugs, she said, because her husband has just been transferred to Mexico and won't give her air fare to get there.

"But he says he'll give you the fare. He just won't give you round trip fare," Glaser points out.

"If he wanted me, he'd give me a ticket to there and back home."

"Then it's not really your fault you're on drugs, is it? It's your grandfather's and your husband's fault."

"Yes."

"Well, then, if you're just a victim and it's not really your fault at all, why are you here for therapy? Maybe you should send your grandfather and husband here for therapy. It's their problem."

"Well, if it's anything I've done, I don't know what it could be."

"Then I don't think we can help you until you realize that you have something to do with what happens to you, that you have some responsibility, that it's not all just other people and fate."

"I'll think about it," she said. "After a while I might get to think it's partly my fault—maybe."

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today also marks the 144th anniversary of the Greek Independence Day, which should have special significance to the United States and to the entire world, because throughout history the Greek people have been in the forefront in the struggle for the liberty of the individual.

Today, Greece, a member of the NATO alliance, is one of our stanchest allies. She has successfully resisted and repulsed the Communists who attempted to infiltrate her after World War II. To the peoples of the captive nations, Greece is, indeed, a symbol of hope for their future independence and freedom. I am, indeed, proud to have this opportunity to pay tribute to a friend and ally on the the 144th anniversary of her independence.

A COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it was my great pleasure to join in the sponsorship of S. 1200, a bill to establish a Court of Veterans Appeals.

Congress has provided a comprehensive system of benefits for veterans, their surviving widows, children, and dependent parents. The extent of this program

is shown by the fact that the budget for fiscal year 1966 contains more than $4 billion for the payment of compensation and pensions. Unfortunately, the law provides that decisions of the Veterans' Administration on all claims for compensation and pension benefits shall be final and conclusive, and cannot be reviewed by any officer of the United States or any court thereof.

Over the years, Representatives and Senators have been approached by veterans seeking their assistance in furthering their attempts to establish service connection for their disabilities. In studying the results of these efforts, I find that the percentage of "wins" has been rather small. Quite possibly those who lost did not have real claims. Nevertheless, I have been impressed by the sincerity and honesty of veteran claimants. In some instances they have convinced me that they have had valid claims to the extent that, upon reading Board of Veteran Appeals decisions in denial, my original views have remained unchanged.

It has been my observation that these cases usually have fallen in the area where the doctrine of reasonable doubt was the determining factor and it was not resolved in the veteran's favor.

This is the type of case I believe would benefit the most by a Court of Veterans Appeals; and I am sure that a considerable number would fall in this category. A veteran who has a case of this sort, and is denied the benefit he is seeking, cannot avoid feeling that he has not received justice. Further recourse to a court would help to dispel this feeling, regardless of the outcome, and, in my opinion, provides sufficient reason for establishing a court.

It has been said before, and I think it bears repeating when considering matters of this sort, that many times the appearance of justice is almost as important as justice itself. If a court can accomplish this—and I believe it can—then certainly it should be established.

There is further justification for it: Military retirement cases can be taken to the U.S. Court of Claims; but, through some strange quirk, benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration are considered gratuities, and are not subject to review by a court, despite the fact that in each instance the basic issue is the establishment of a disability which arose in service.

The Government life insurance program administered by the Veterans' Administration is an exception. Insurance cases can be taken into court, because they are considered contract cases. It is my feeling—and I know it is shared by others—that when a man enters the Armed Forces, he does so with the assurance that should he incur a disability while serving, he will be compensated for it. This is an implied contract; and when a controversy arises, a court should be available to settle it.

The Veterans' Administration over the years has done an admirable job; but it is an inescapable fact that the Board of Veterans Appeals is in the unenviable position of making determinations in claims against the very organization of which it is an integral part. Justice can never be fully served under these conditions.

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators to several editorials and an article commenting on the President's address to Congress on March 15 and the proposed legislation on the so-called voting rights. These editorials merit the attention of all Members of the Congress who wish to consider objectively this proposed legislation, which the President is demanding be passed with limited consideration and study. These editorials and the article are as follow:

"This State and Voting," from the State, of Columbia, S.C., dated March 3, 1965.

"The President's Speech," from the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., dated March 17, 1965.

"Asking Too Much for Too Little," from the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., dated March 17, 1965.

"Has This Nation Truly Come to Such a Pass?" from the Spartanburg Herald, of Spartanburg, S.C., dated March 17, 1965.

"More Vicious Than Anticipated," from the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga., dated March 18, 1965.

"Innocent Till Proved Guilty?" from the Augusta Herald, of Augusta, Ga., dated March 20, 1965.

"Johnson, the Omnipotent," from the Savannah Evening Press, of Savannah, Ga., dated March 16, 1965.

"L.B.J.'s Voting Rights Speech," from Human Events, of Washington, D.C., dated March 27, 1965.

"Sixteen Laws Already Available," from the Chattanooga News-Free Press, of Chattanooga, Tenn., dated March 15, 1965.

"An Offense to South Carolina," from the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., dated March 22, 1965.

"Question Lingers on Voting Bill," an article by Mr. Richard Wilson which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on March 24, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these editorials and the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks, together with my newsletter, dated March 22, 1965, entitled "The Art of Omission."

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

[From the State, Mar. 20, 1965]

THIS STATE AND VOTING

Under one provision of President Johnson's proposed Voting Rights Act, it looks as if South Carolinians are going to have to register and vote whether they have an interest in doing so or not—if they want to exercise the last chance to manage their own voter registration.

The device which would bring Federal voting registrars to South Carolina is the provision which would come into play if less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age are registered or if less than 50 percent vote in an election.

Negro leaders openly say that Negroes in South Carolina generally face no obstacles whatsoever in registering to vote. In fact, it was recently discovered that one person with a whole string of disqualifying convictions had been registered.

It may come as a shock to the people in Washington, but obviously less than 50 percent of the voting age whites and Negroes participated in the last election, for which there was nevertheless a record turnout.

Some simple calculations are revealing. The State has a population of about 2,300,000 according to the last census. About 35 percent are Negroes.

Assuming that 50 percent of this group of voting age (the actual percentage is higher), this would leave more than a million white persons of voting age, and about 400,000 Negroes. Last fall 524,578 voted out of 772,748 persons who had registered.

This leaves us with less than half the eligibles registered—probably for both white and Negro. Estimates are that about 400,000 white persons voted last fall—certainly less than 40 percent of those of voting age.

According to Justice Department figures, incidentally, approximately 34 percent of eligible (according to age) Negroes are registered in the State. The percentage of white and Negro registrants seems fairly close.

Thus would come the Federal registrars—even though on one can cite any reason other than citizen apathy for their having to come.

South Carolina, it seems might have to engage a little compulsory registration, and voting, if it wishes to keep control of its election machinery.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Mar. 17, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

President Johnson responded to the pressures of Selma with an ultimatum to Congress.

The Federal Government, he declared, will usurp State and local authority for the registration of voters.

Specifically, he said, the Government will lower the bars to Negroes. He was not specific about Indians, Puerto Ricans, Eskimos, or Mexican-Americans, but he left the impression that he included illiterate whites.

His drastic and sweeping recommendations in an address to the Congress and the Nation were designed to cure isolated evils where some States and communities deliberately deny voting privileges to Negroes by subterfuge or unreasonable standards of suffrage.

These problem areas exist in the South, so the President is repeating a common fallacy, the condemnation of the whole for the offense of the few.

As spelled out in a news release, a key provision of the President's new civil rights program is: "Without resorting to the courts, the Federal Government could wrest control of voter registration in all problem areas of the South. The United States could enter wherever 50 percent or less of eligible adults in a State or county either failed to register or vote in last November's general elections."

South Carolina is lumped in that category, but is not guilty of denying registration and votes to Negroes. The Federal Government has tried unsuccessfully to find evidence of discrimination or intimidation.

One has only to visit the polls on election day or the courthouses on registration days to see that Negroes in this State register and vote the same as whites. The qualifications for both are the same. The requirements for eligibility are simple.

The applicant must have resided a year in the State, 6 months in the county and 60 days in the precinct. He must be 21 and have a citizenship record free of felonies. He must be able to read a section of the Constitution or show proof of property assessed

at a minimum of $300. The standard for voting is as reasonable as it is simple.

It behooves the Congress to remove the sectionalism of the President's demands.

The President revealed in his address that he was susceptible to the pressures of racial demonstrators—of being blackjacked, as he had expressed it earlier. His reference to northern cities showed that he was sensitive to the criticism of Martin Luther King's lieutenants and such racial radicals as Cecil Moore, of Philadelphia. As he spoke, work was still under way to complete the bill for presentation, which indicated the expediency the President felt.

Last April, the White House was concerned about the effects of Communist associations and influences upon King and his movement. Now, a year later, King has become the dominant figure in American politics. The President has adopted his theme, "We Shall Overcome."

King's frequent consultations at the White House, his defiance of State and Federal authority in Alabama, his constant pressures against the President and the Congress—all have contributed to the urgency and extremity of the President's action and the frenzy in the Congress to prevent further violence of racial demonstrations North and South.

The President was correct in his sermon when he said that no American—no qualified American, that is—should be denied the right to vote. But in the protection of that right, other constitutional rights should also be respected and preserved.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Mar. 17, 1965]

ASKING TOO MUCH FOR TOO LITTLE

No one can argue with the basic premise set forth in President Johnson's over-dramatized special address to Congress and the Nation Monday night:

Every qualified citizen of the United States is entitled to the privilege of voting in any election which affects his welfare.

That privilege—not an unmitigated or unrestrained right, but a privilege—is inherent and explicitly provided for in the Constitutions of the United States and the 50 States.

Nor can anyone deny that many persons, not all of them Negroes by any means, have been denied the privilege of registering to vote and to cast a free and unfettered ballot in certain local, State or National elections. There have been flagrant violations of the Federal Constitution and even of the Constitutions and statutes of the States by officials of those same States.

But that is as far as we can go, and as far as any one should go with Mr. Johnson's speech. It wound up as another eulogy of the Johnsonian utopia and at points stooped to outright demagoguery.

The administration has allowed the Nation and the States to suffer too much and is now asking too much to achieve too little in the way of results which could have been achieved long ago by more orderly processes. These would not have created the existing bitterness between groups and the wounds on the body politic, much less go on to make them worse.

The President is asking Congress to enact legislation which, in a few States at least, would allow Federal officials to move in, suspend such qualifications for registration as literacy tests and register all persons of voting age, seemingly as expeditiously as numbers racket tickets are handed out in the ghettos of New York City.

Early reports on the proposed law, such as they are, indicate that anyone meeting age and residency requirements, who is mentally competent and has not been convicted of a felony would be declared eligible and would be registered by an appointed Federal registrar without further question.

Who would define mentally competent and how, and how it would be measured, is an interesting question.

President Johnson again is putting Congress in the position of legislating, or refusing to legislate, in an atmosphere of hysteria, bitterness, prejudice, and the threat of violence. The situation is worse than it was when the Civil Rights Act was passed last year.

What's more, he is asking for new legislation before the Civil Rights Act has been fully tried as a possible solution to the impasse which has developed in some areas.

Persons who, as President Johnson says, have been "illegally denied the right to vote" have always had recourse to the State and Federal courts to assert that right. The Civil Rights Act gives the Federal Government the power to step in and initiate court action.

The President says this would take too long. As a matter of practical fact, however, it would be easy enough to obtain a court order enjoining election officials from discriminating in any matter pertaining to suffrage, and such an order could be enforced overnight.

Unless the purpose is to wipe out all State voting qualifications, there is no other—except to appeal to the Negro masses who have been worked up to a fever pitch by agitators who have made the most of isolated State or local shortcomings.

At one point in his speech, the President made a sotto voce appeal to the demonstrators to calm down, but it was lost in his condemnation of State officials which damned the whole South to criticize a part of it. He spoke of the once quiet and lovely town of Selma, Ala., as some ugly pit of hell.

He spoke of the American Negro meaning, of course, the demonstrators following Martin Luther King and his motley, many-hued henchmen as the real hero of a struggle to overcome bigotry and injustice.

He named the wrong heroes.

The real heroes are the law-abiding Negroes who have quietly taken advantage of their opportunities, who have refrained from activities which at the very least amount to incitement to violence and who have qualified, registered, and voted on their individual merits.

The real heroes, too, are the white Americans, especially millions in the South, who have patiently helped Negroes who deserved help and who have made their influence felt for the realization of the rights of all men.

Heroes, too, are the thousands of law enforcement officers who have been able to keep their heads and have refused to be provoked by insult and injury into the use of violent force.

It is these people, rather than the politicians in Washington, the demagogs in many places and the agitators and demonstrators in the streets, who will save the situation these people have created—if at this late date it can be prevented from becoming chaos or anarchy.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Mar. 17, 1965]

HAS THIS NATION TRULY COME TO SUCH A PASS?

Has it come to such an utterly incomprehensible pass in this country?

Apparently it has.

The President of the United States has proposed legislation deliberately calculated to discriminate against one section and not the other.

Congress, they say, will approve his plan without hesitation.

The measure would eliminate virtually all qualifications for voting.

But only in the South. The fact that Alaska is included is purely incidental and without practical effect.

The administration says it is presuming that in any State where fewer than 50 percent of the people of voting age actually voted there was racial discrimination.

It happens that this standard fits the six Southern States and Alaska. That's all.

Negroes are privileged to register and vote in South Carolina. Three U.S. Attorney Generals have tried to establish proof to the contrary, but they failed. The Civil Rights Commission likewise has produced no justifiable complaint of that nature in this State.

Yet, South Carolina is presumed to be guilty.

And what is the punishment?

The State is to lose all control over the qualifications for its voters. (But New York and Chicago, where political corruption and manipulation have been rampant, are not touched.)

The legislation will make possible the assigning of full-time Federal employes to see to it that every Negro of voting age, though many may have to sign with an X, are qualified in South Carolina. But not in the North.

Negro citizens stand to lose as much as any others when the framework of responsible government is shattered.

The Negro in the South—at least in this part of the South—has progressed immensely in the modern era. He has accomplished his significant improvement through his own talents, determination, and intelligence.

Many doors of economic and educational opportunity are opening to him.

The ultimate destiny of the Negro will not be served by the power of illiterate and uninformed voters; nor will it be gained by dissension and violence.

His proper role will be won by continued intelligent development of the skills and talents he possesses.

How tragically ironic it will be if this role is destroyed by the excesses of those who cry the loudest that they are his saviors.

It can happen if the premium is put on ignorance and disruption rather than intelligent participation in good government.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Mar. 18, 1965]

MORE VICIOUS THAN ANTICIPATED

Yesterday the Chronicle, in an editorial, repeated its often-expressed belief that no American citizen, anywhere, who is qualified under the fair administration of his State's voting laws should be prevented from registering or from voting.

We expressed the hope that the voting rights bill which the Johnson administration would send to the Congress, following the President's address on that subject would be reasonable and fair to all concerned. That was before the bill had been delivered and made public.

Now that the proposed bill has reached the Congress it must be pointed out that the President, in an effort to secure rights for some, would destroy rights for others. The bill would, in several ways, violate the principles of government which have made the United States a land of liberty. Based on information in a news wire service account, the following conclusions may be reached:

It would provide for application of the Federal intervention process in any State or county where literacy or other tests were used as of November 1, 1964, and where the number of registered voters or the number of votes cast in the November 4 election was below 50 percent. Thus, the bill would make no allowance for voter apathy. Its provisions could be put into effect merely

because registered voters preferred to go fishing.

The bill says that if a State or county wished to avoid coming under the terms of proposed law, it would have to prove it to a three-judge Federal Court in Washington, D.C., that there had been no voter discrimination in the past 10 years. This provision would adopt the principle that the officials involved would be considered guilty until they could prove themselves innocent, a complete reversal of our system of law. It would make present officials liable for what their predecessors did for a decade in the past. It would move an alleged offense from the jurisdiction in which it was said to have occurred to Washington, D.C.

A court decision that a county or other voting district had practiced discrimination would bar that district from seeking to escape the effects of the law for 10 years. This 10-year probationary sentence meted out through Federal intervention is a clear indication that the purpose of the bill is not corrective, but punitive.

The bill provides that the U.S. Attorney General could appoint Federal vote registrars (they are called examiners in the bill) for any election district if he received complaints from 20 persons in that district that they had been denied voting rights. It would require not proof, as fair judicial procedure would seem to require—only complaints. The Attorney General also could impose Federal control, the news dispatch says, either on complaint "or if he thought such action were otherwise necessary." We have indeed lost a great part of our heritage of law if what one man "thinks" is to be legal justification for usurping State or local functions.

Any person who registered with a federally appointed registrar up to 45 days before election day could vote, regardless of State laws imposing an earlier registration deadline. Here is something which is totally irrelevant to voters' registration rights. It is simply a matter of highhanded rewriting of State laws in Washington.

Any registered voter refused the right to cast his ballot could complain to a Federal official, and the local U.S. district court could withhold any certification of the election until this person voted. This procedure makes possible a system of harassment by which one person in each State could hold up the entire certification of elections in his State. Should protests come in mass numbers—a sort of huge election sitdown—then results could be delayed for months while Federal officials checked out thousands of complaints to see if the complaints were actually from persons qualified, and if they actually had been denied the right to vote.

States would be prohibited from passing new voter-qualification laws to avoid the effect of the new Federal intervention statute, except that such a law might be permitted if a three-judge Federal court in Washington, D.C., approved it as not interfering with voter rights. In other words, no State legislature would have the definite power to correct by statute any present inequity. Such an attempt would be invalid until subject to review and approval by an out-of-State court. The necessity for carrying all actions under this bill to Washington, D.C., makes it appear that the administration no longer trusts even its own Federal judges outside of the Capital City.

Penalties for interfering with the right to vote would be up to 5 years in prison, a $50,000 fine, or both.

This is a bill which would curtail more liberties than it would assure. No matter how much it represents the thinking of radical advisers, President Johnson must bear the blame for a wholly vicious approach to a problem demanding understanding and reason.

Certainly there are enough levelheaded men in our Congress to point out, during debate, the flaws in this ill-considered proposal.

If they fail to prevail, there are potential tragic consequences for all Americans in the measure which is being sold to the Nation in the glittering guise of equal rights.

What no man must forget, no matter the color of his skin, is that a Federal bureaucracy, once it gains the power to impose its will, can exercise that power to the detriment of any group or cause on which it may care to turn its wrath.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald, Mar. 20, 1965]

INNOCENT TILL PROVED GUILTY?

There is something ironic in the comments of three Augusta Negro leaders on President Johnson's proposed voter registration bill, and the irony shows just how unfair and unreasonable the bill would be.

The leaders—the Reverend C. S. Hamilton, Henry Brooks, and Attorney John Ruffin—did not criticize the proposed bill. However, their comments to newsmen Wednesday clearly indicated that "evils" the bill is designed to eradicate are in many instances more imaginary than real.

The bill, if passed, would pave the way for Federal intervention in the registration of voters where (1) literacy or other tests were used as of November 1, 1964, as voter qualifications, and where (2) the number of registered voters or the number of those voting in the November 4 election was below 50 percent.

The stated purpose of the bill is the elimination of discrimination against Negroes seeking the franchise. And, obviously, President Johnson presumes that voter registration and/or voter turnout statistics can be used to pinpoint such discriminatory practices.

We have no doubt that in many cases highly unfair "tests" are employed by voter registrars to prohibit Negroes from voting. But this is not the case in Richmond County, yet it, too, apparently would fall under the provisions of the proposed bill.

Each of the three Negro leaders said they know of no discriminatory practices here to keep Negroes from the polls. They attributed the absence of many qualified Negroes on election days to sheer apathy.

Hamilton, vice chairman of the Georgia chapter of the NAACP, said he has not had more than three complaints in his 8½ years in Augusta. Even then, he explained, "These people had trouble with the literacy requirements" necessary for registration in Richmond County. Ruffin and Brooks said they have had no complaints at all, and Hamilton added that even when a voter registration drive succeeds in qualifying new voters, arduous effort is needed to get them to the polls on election days.

How, then, we ask, can President Johnson or Congress possibly justify the application of the proposed bill to places like Richmond County? Obviously, the statistics of voter activity here point to no iniquitous evil. They point, instead, to voter apathy among both whites and Negroes.

As we see it, the proposed legislation reflects the hypocrisy we have learned to expect from Washington relative to civil rights. For while it so righteously flails prejudice in the South, it reveals its own prejudice toward the South.

Surely, means other than sweeping legislation which indicts communities so rashly and unfairly can be found to remedy real discrimination. President Johnson's proposed bill is nothing short of Federal tyranny disguised as weeping altruism.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Evening Press, Mar. 16, 1965]

JOHNSON, THE OMNIPOTENT

Just 10 weeks after he delivered his state of the Union message to Congress in a similar nighttime personal appearance, President Johnson appeared before the Congress and the American people to present a rather strange message. If it is possible to get a hybrid mixture by crossing Pandora's box with an iceberg, this is what the man from Texas sought to achieve last night. In short, there is more to it than meets the eye.

How the President can equate the events at Selma, Ala., with those at Lexington and Concord—or even Appomattox—is a question which should weigh heavily on the mind of every thinking American. Perhaps Mr. Johnson provides the ready answer when he says that those who advise us to hold on the past are denying the future. It would appear that the President likes to take poetic license with our glorious history and heritage when it suits his mood and purpose and then discard that very same heritage on the scrap heap in order to score a point of political advantage.

While he put a little frosting on the cake to diffuse and confuse the unsuspecting, the President left no doubt whatsoever that his remarks were a silver platter response to those who had demonstrated at Selma and in the Capital of the Nation. This time, more dramatically than the aftermath of Birmingham, a President of the United States capitulated to "mobrocracy" and lawlessness.

Lest anyone draw an erroneous conclusion, we here and now reaffirm our faith in the vitality of the U.S. Constitution. We deplore, with equal vigor, any and all attempts to distort this document from its original shape and purpose for individual or group gains to the advantage of any other.

The Constitution of this Nation is a whole document and any effort to lift fragments of the whole to press a single advantage ignores the restraints and guarantees embodied in the whole fabric. Fractionalization can only lead to ultimate destruction.

The wording of the 15th amendment should be clear to one and all. There is, however, a tendency to gloss over the fact that this is not the sole reference to voting rights contained in the Constitution. The 17th amendment, for example, states that in regard to the election of U.S. Senators "the electors in each State shall have the qualification requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

Section IV, article I while giving the legislatures the primary responsibility for determining the time, places, and manner of holding elections for U.S. Senators and Representatives retains to the Congress the power to alter such regulations with an exception. The exception leaves to the States without question the right to designate the places Senators are chosen.

Thus, it is easy to see that the Founding Fathers intended that the several States should retain control in large measure over the method in which elections are conducted. The Nation can ill afford to have these principles gutted by Presidential whims, acts of a kowtowing Congress or a misguided Supreme Court ruling. Principles once destructed are not quite the same even if the pieces are glued together carefully.

In almost the same breath in which the President spoke of upholding the Constitution, he dignified and glorified those who demonstrated by terming them the real heroes. Not a single mention was made of those law enforcement officials who were sworn to uphold the law and did.

How can we ever have respect for law and order in this Nation again when the Chief

Magistrate of the country gives sanction to those who flout not only State and local laws but orders of the Federal courts to whom they have turned in their quest for special recognition?

It would seem that the President, in adopting this stance showed his ignorance of article IV of the Constitution which states: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence."

Where is there a man who can truthfully deny that some of our States have been subjected to an invasion by persons who have no lawful grievances in the States they invade? Where is there a man who can deny that there has been domestic violence? It would seem that the President has fallen victim to a case of selective color vision and semantical constitutional blindness.

The club that the President brandished last night would, for all practical purposes, abolish every form of formal requirement that one needs to meet in order to register to vote. Registration blanks would simply list the person's name, address, age and length of residence. No provision is made, according to the pronouncement, for the exclusion of convicted felons, lunatics or illiterates.

The real catch to putting the Federal Government in the driver's seat is the proposal which would allow Federal registrars to work in any State or election district where 50 percent of the eligible voters were not registered or 50 percent did not vote in the general elections. We can only assume that the Federal registrars will be picked by the Civil Service Commission through the odious process known as selective certification.

The President's proposal calls for Federal intrusion into every election held in this country and this conceivably includes party primaries, too. He is not content with Congress acting in a procedural fashion as it did with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Mr. Johnson demands immediate action.

After unveiling his latest plan for submission to a militant minority, the President went on to detail the ingredients of his "dream." Without appearing to be sacrilegious, one can only conclude that the President wants to go down in the history books as the omnipotent one. His visions and pronounced plans to implement them tend to put him on a pedestal higher than that reserved for God or His Son. This type of omnipotence is out of character with the American dream and is a dangerous philosophy to follow. It can only lead down the path toward total disaster.

[From Human Events, Mar. 27, 1965]

L.B.J.'s VOTING RIGHTS SPEECH

Does any Northern nonsegregationist politician have the courage to challenge President Johnson on his civil rights speech? Will somebody, anybody, peg his talk before a joint session of Congress as the puerile, dangerous, demagogic stuff and nonsense that it was?

Surely the death of the Reverend James Reeb was a terrible and tragic event and undoubtedly some Alabama troopers were guilty of excessive force during bloody Sunday, as the civil rights demonstrators refer to the first breakup of their proposed march to Montgomery. These actions were reprehensible and their perpetrators should be punished.

But the President's address, we believe, was not an authentic plea for Negro equality before the law. Nor was it a worthy plea for equal voting rights, though if anyone might be an expert on the abridgement of voters' rights it should be the incumbent President, once referred to as Landslide Lyndon for his mysterious 87-vote victory to the Senate in 1948.

No; Lyndon's message was something else again. It had the unerring ring of the charlatan, not the statesman; the sales pitch of Elmer Gantry, not St. Paul.

For if the truth be told, the President's talk was simply an outrageous use of prime time to propagandize the American people over three television networks for 60 minutes about his domestic political program. Furthermore, it was a wonderful opportunity for L.B.J. to indulge in self-adulation with a major altering of the facts in his own life.

The "voting rights" topic was only the launching pad for serious discussion about the Great Society and the even greater Lyndon.

A President sincerely interested in securing voting rights legislation for the Negro, with aid from both sides of the aisle, would have rigorously avoided jeopardizing that plan with a crass plunge into the political arena and a thinly veiled demand for congressional enactment of highly dubious anti-poverty legislation and other Federal welfare measures. But not L.B.J.

The Negro, according to Johnson, must not only have ballot rights. He must also possess a "trained mind" (L.B.J.'s education boondoggle), a "healthy body" (L.B.J.'s medicare package), a "decent home" (L.B.J.'s housing program), et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

And what else did the President's stirring message teach us? For one thing, we were overcome to learn that President Johnson, who never sponsored a civil rights bill until 1959 and who put a restrictive covenant in his own property, has been the champion of the civil rights movement ever since the late 1920's when he saw Mexican-Americans with "the pain of prejudice" in their eyes.

As his harangue droned to a close, the President's touches of megalomania began to grow lyrical: "I want to be the President who educated young people * * * I want to be the President who helped feed the hungry * * * I want to be the President who helped to end war among the brothers of this earth. * * *"

Where, oh where, is the Republican to retort to such blather? Perhaps the networks will give equal time.

The entire Nation, not only Selma, has been engulfed with civil rights demonstrators in the past several weeks. Men have been killed in Alabama and hurt in Washington, D.C. Plainly, President Johnson could have done a great service to the country by bluntly warning the demonstrators, who have helped to incite this violence, that such demonstrations will no longer be tolerated, now that Congress and the courts have taken over.

But the President, for reason known only to him, felt it best to sanction the demonstrations and glorify the demonstrators.

The Negro's "demonstrations have been designed to call attention to injustice, to provoke change and stir reform." (Indeed, it took 8 weeks of Selma demonstrations before Johnson moved.) "And who among us can say we would have made the same progress were it not for his persistent bravery * * *?" In other words, continue the lie-ins, on with the sleep-ins, hurrah for the sit-ins, forward with the marches—unless, of course, they're at the White House.

The President's demagogy, we feel, attained special heights. And it was reflected in Johnson's peremptory demand that Congress enact his bill posthaste: "The time for waiting is gone," he said.

It was also reflected in Lyndon's egregious assertion that there is "no constitutional issue" regarding his new bill to amend the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

But there is a constitutional issue, Mr. President. There is nothing in the Constitution that gives broad authority to the Federal Government to establish voter qualifications within the State.

Article I of the Constitution confers on the States the right to establish qualifications for their own voters in State and local elections. The 15th amendment says only, "The right of the citizen 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."

But under the Johnson proposals, the politically appointed Attorney General, without a court order or proof of discrimination, can see to it that Federal registrars (euphemistically called examiners) will insure registration of voters in State, Federal, and local elections. Moreover, these registrars can totally ignore State qualifications such as literacy tests and the like.

The "goal" of L.B.J.'s legislation, reports the Washington Post, "is to strike down all discriminatory literacy tests, so-called understanding and character tests, and even so-called moral tests, unless it can be shown that the applicant has been convicted of a felony."

Certainly, there is legitimate doubt as to whether it is constitutional for Congress to eliminate these State tests. Senator SAM ERVIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, considered one of the top legal experts in the country, argues that for years Congress has believed such legislation as the President proposes could only become legal if it were submitted in the form of constitutional amendments.

Notes the Chicago Tribune about Lyndon's vote package: "These were originally the doctrines of the post Civil War radical Republicans with the force bills of the 1870's, which were struck down as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of that day."

The Washington Evening Star, while generally favorable to L.B.J.'s proposals, also commented: "For our part, we prefer to reserve judgment until what the President calls a 'simple uniform standard' becomes available for scrutiny.

"One reason for this is the presentation of fiction as fact in some parts of his address. For instance, referring to the undeniable efforts in some areas of the South to keep Negroes from voting, Mr. Johnson said: 'The fact is that the only way to pass these barriers is to show a white skin.' The fact is that is not a fact—at least as far as Alabama is concerned. Assuming that Governor Wallace told the truth on Sunday, and we have seen no denial of what he said, there are some 115,000 Negroes registered and eligible to vote in his State. This represents more than 20 percent of all the votes cast in Alabama in the 1960 presidential election. So we want to see what kind of voting standard. * * * The true test is whether an individual, white or black, is qualified. * * * It does not seem to us too much to ask that all voters should pass a reasonable, modest literacy test."

Another major argument against the President's bill is that under the 1957, 1960, and 1964 Civil Rights Acts the machinery to achieve fair voting is already available. In Selma, as a result of a Federal court order in February, nearly 3,000 Negroes have made applications to register. In the absence of proper cause, if these applicants aren't registered by July a Federal judge can insure that they will be registered through court-appointed officials.

The political bias of these election proposals is strikingly apparent. Under L.B.J.'s formula, Federal registrars will be able to go into those States which have literacy or similar qualifying tests and in which the director of the census determines that fewer than 50 percent of the people were registered

to vote in the November 1964 election, or fewer than 50 percent actually voted.

As of now, seven States are immediately brought under the scope of the L.B.J. proposals. Five of these States just happened to vote for Senator Barry Goldwater in 1964. If the politically appointed registrars are able to do away with major voting qualifications, including literacy tests, it is not hard to imagine that thousands of "functionally illiterate Negroes," to borrow a term from BOBBY KENNEDY, could be put on the rolls by these registrars. Since Negroes tend to vote heavily Democratic, the political motivation of L.B.J. and his cohorts of these proposals are not hard to understand.

Negroes certainly have the right to vote on the same basis as other citizens—and this should be strictly enforced—but voting illiterates, black or white, will not help the democratic process. It would be wise for Congress to take a longer look at the President's proposals than he has suggested.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, Mar. 15, 1965]

SIXTEEN LAWS ALREADY AVAILABLE

President Lyndon B. Johnson is scheduled to speak to a joint session of Congress tonight to propose enactment of a new voting rights bill. This may give some people the impression that there is not now sufficient legal protection for the right to vote. But such a conclusion would be most erroneous.

Already on the lawbooks as Mr. Johnson prepares to speak are 16 laws designed to protect the right to vote.

It is not an absence of legal means to secure the right to vote that has brought a crisis to Alabama and to our Nation. The crisis has been a result of determination by Martin Luther King and other agitators not to use the law but to use demonstrations by mobs in the streets instead.

Using the 16 laws now in force would not attract so much attention. Using the laws through calm court procedure would not attract big contributions to the treasuries of the agitators. Street marches by mobs almost always bring conflict and conflict is what the agitators feed on to gain personal fame, power and money.

Mr. Johnson realizes how these things are. Mr. Johnson is a supreme politician. And so instead of pointing out the availability of 16 laws that might be used—some of them for civil action to assure the right to vote and some of them for criminal action to punish any who unjustly deny the right to vote—Mr. Johnson calls for enactment of another law for which he can take credit in the eyes of the agitators who have disrupted society instead of using the available laws for any legitimate aspirations.

We do not believe that in every case local authorities have acted justly, wisely, or well when it comes to the administration of voting regulations. We believe every citizen of each State should have an equal right with all other voters in his State to register and vote. Regulations for voting vary from State to State, as the Constitution provides for. But whatever regulations are in force in any State should be applicable on a fair basis to all in that State. Since this may not have been the case in every situation, there may properly be resort to the many laws available for redress. But there is no propriety in mob action that not only ignores legal remedy but stirs illegal violence.

The Constitution provides in article I, section 4: "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of chosing Senators." Under this provisions, therefore, Congress may act only on times and manner of holding elections—not on registration qualifications of voters.

In article I, section 2, the Constitution says how qualifications of voters, or "electors," as they are called here, may be established: "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." In other words, the qualifications necessary for a voter to vote for a member of his State house of representatives shall be the same qualifications required for participation in Federal elections.

The 15th amendment states: "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. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

With this background, the laws protecting the right to vote have been enacted.

If the existing laws had been used, there would be no crisis today. And there is no real need for a new law such as Mr. Johnson will call for tonight.

IF SHOE WERE ON OTHER FOOT

There are some people who have a prejudice against Alabama's Gov. George Wallace and so they don't want to hear or heed anything he has to say. If they did, they might be embarrassed by the soundness of what he points out on some occasions.

Yesterday, a television program had been set up for the purpose of roasting Governor Wallace, a procedure which is supposed to be highly pleasing to those throughout the country who prefer this sort of thing to bull fighting and bear baiting. But it didn't turn out that way. Governor Wallace made some points that thoughtful people need to consider. The Governor showed, for example, how a nun had been quoted in a news story as saying a hospital had denied an injured Negro treatment, but that the nun denied making any such statement, that the Negro did receive treatment, and that if there were any instance in which a Negro or anybody else were denied treatment, Governor Wallace would see to it personally that something was done about it.

This, the Alabama Governor said, was merely one minor example of the inflammatory way the situation in the South has been misrepresented. He himself would be inflamed if told a hospital had denied a Negro treatment, the Governor said—but it simply wasn't true, as the quoted nun herself attested. The Governor never did get a good answer as to how the lie had been reported in the first place. He did show how agitation by misrepresentation works.

But perhaps the most pointed observation by the Governor was contained in his comparison of the Selma situation with what might have happened if the agitation had been transplanted to New York. And it is not unreasonable to suggest application of the situation to New York, for that city and many other Northern cities have had racial riots far worse than anything that has occurred in the South.

The people of Selma have been the victims of outside-agitated mobs of demonstrators in their streets for a solid 8 weeks. Can you imagine that? What, Governor Wallace asked, would New York do if several hundred demonstrators should mill around Times Square in New York City for 8 solid weeks?

We all know the answer. New York wouldn't tolerate such a situation. Selma has. Yet, said Governor Wallace, the people of Selma have as much right to have their streets clear as do the people of New York.

When President Lyndon B. Johnson found the halls of the White House cluttered with a dozen sit-in demonstrators a few days ago, he didn't put up with it for very many hours.

When Washington police found Pennsylvania Avenue cluttered with demonstrators lying down on the pavement, they didn't put up with it for very many minutes.

Yet Selma has had it for 8 weeks—and it continues.

We happen to believe that in many places in the South the reaction of officials and innocent citizens to the mob demonstrations has not been very wise. Yet those who are not the direct targets and victims of such mob actions find it hard to imagine the pressures that are built up—one purpose being to provoke legally constituted authorities into making mistakes, or into allowing situations which bring about violence and injury and even death. These are the "tools" of the agitators.

It is easy to criticize Alabama. But nobody can conceive toleration of an 8-week-long demonstration in any Northern city.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Mar. 22, 1965]

AN OFFENSE TO SOUTH CAROLINA

President Johnson's voting rights bill is commendable in its intent and salutary in its declaration 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."

But its enforcement provisions violate truth, honor, the Constitution, and are fundamentally discriminatory against whole segments of the American citizenry.

Six Southern States are singled out for discriminatory treatment, based on an arithmetical proviso of percentage of eligible adults registered to vote. A 50-percent voting or registration level triggers the discrimination against these States or areas.

South Carolina is included.

The Government's contention is that the less than 50 percent registration or voting record in our State is prima facie evidence of discrimination. Such an allegation is utterly without foundation, palpably fraudulent, and is an offense to the whole people of our State.

For years this newspaper has insisted upon the prompt registration of all voters whose eligibility should be determined by fair tests, uniformly applied without regard for race, color, or sex. We have insisted, as has our State government, upon no discrimination against Negro registrants.

The mathematical computations of low registrations in select South Carolina counties led two Attorneys General, William Rogers under Eisenhower and Robert Kennedy under his brother, to dispatch investigators to our State. In both instances, no discrimination was found.

On the few occasions in which minor infractions were discovered, swift remedy was effected by State and local insistence upon equity for all.

In short, there is at present no discrimination against the Negro in South Carolina. And the whole State is resolved that each citizen is entitled to register without discrimination.

(Two major factors account for the State's low percentage: (1) The high degree of illiteracy among both Negroes and whites, with the greater rate found among the former; and (2) an apathy deplored by Negro registration leaders themselves.)

Yet, South Carolina—under the President's proposed bill—would be forced to give up its simple literacy test because of the statistical hypocrisy of the bill. Other States would be allowed to retain their literacy tests.

Literacy tests, fairly administered, have been sustained by a succession of Supreme Court decisions stretching from the 1870's to 1959. In 1898, the Court held that literacy tests which are drafted so as to apply alike to all applicants for the voting franchise would be deemed to be fair on their face,

and in the absence of proof of discriminatory enforcement could not be viewed as denying the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment.

Denial of suffrage by literacy tests (such as the Boswell amendment to the Alabama constitution) was quite rightly stricken down by the Court.

In the Guinn case and in the 1959 Lassiter case, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the rights of the States to impose fairly administered literacy tests, since "the ability to read and write likewise has some relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot."

The fundamental question Congress must face with regard to South Carolina is: Has the State of South Carolina sought to disenfranchise the Negro overtly through statutory enactment or covertly through inequitable administration of its electoral laws?

The answer in both instances is negative and has been sustained by two investigations of two Attorneys General of the United States.

We cannot speak for, and do not attempt to speak for, other States singled out for discriminatory treatment under the President's bill.

But we resent the absolutely false allegations of the bill and urge the Congress to consider with exacting care the remedy that has been proposed. We strongly suggest alteration of the proposed legislation, which is unconstitutional and discriminatory on its face.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 24, 1965]

QUESTION LINGERS ON VOTING BILL

(By Richard Wilson)

The question that the advocates of the new voting rights bill have as yet failed to answer adequately is this: Why should literacy tests as a qualification for voting be perfectly all right in 45 of the 50 States but invalid in the other 5?

If a voter in Alabama who cannot read or write is qualified to vote in a Federal or any other election why should not an illiterate New Yorker have the same right? The right to vote certainly has no connection with the number of people who vote, and it is manifestly unjust to bar an illiterate from voting in a State where less than 50 percent of the qualified voters cast their ballots, but to permit him to vote in a State where more than 50 percent of the voters go to the polls.

This, nevertheless, would be the effect in 606 counties in 10 States of the passage of the voter rights bill sent to Congress by President Johnson.

The only justification offered for this anomaly is that it is the only way to force election officials in those 10 States to register Negroes to vote. Otherwise, they will enforce prohibitive regulations that prevent Negroes from voting, but not enforce the same regulations on whites who could not meet the qualifications.

This is another example of the devious legislative tactics in the Johnson administration to achieve results by legal circumlocution. Another outstanding example is the aid to education bill that attempts to get around the church-state issue.

From the President's recent statements it can be concluded that what he really desires is the removal of virtually all restrictions on voting for persons 18 years old, and over, if they are sane, and in spite of the fact that the Supreme Court would have to reverse itself in finding that the imposition of reasonable qualifications is valid.

It must be admitted that literacy tests as a qualification for voting are honored in the breach in the North. Thirty States have no such requirements. States that do have literacy requirements often do not enforce them, or the enforcement is so cursory as to be meaningless.

New York requires proof of an eighth grade education or demonstration of the ability to read as a requirement for voters. This excludes a great many people, including recently arrived Puerto Ricans, from voting and is being challenged in the courts. Previous Federal legislation proposals would have required a sixth grade education as proof of literacy.

Residency requirements are universal. In short, people are not born in this country with an inherent right to vote at any time or any place. This is a right for which they must qualify by tests that vary from State to State, and which was affirmed by a 1959 Supreme Court decision. The layman would think that the Constitution is quite clear on this point in its 1st article and in the 17th amendment, to say nothing of the 1959 decision of the Supreme Court.

Furthermore, the Johnson voting rights bill recognizes this principle by providing that a voter shall be stricken from the rolls if he fails to vote at least once in three consecutive years. Thus the Federal law would impose restrictions Congress regards as reasonable while outlawing other restrictions imposed by the States.

Why is not the issue confronted squarely? Why is Congress not asked to abolish literacy requirements in all States altogether?

The answer to that is clear. It is because literacy requirements have validity both in reason and in law. It makes sense that a voter should have at least an elementary ability to read and write the language of the country in which he resides. It makes sense that States should have the power to set reasonable minimum standards for voters, and the proposed law recognizes that by itself setting some standards. It hardly needs to be argued, also, that a Federal law should apply equally to the citizens of all States.

The strange, awkward, and unequal nature of this new legislation shows how wrong it is to try to legislate on such complicated matters in an atmosphere of violence-provoking public demonstrations.

The Johnson administration was rushed into the presentation of a law that has so many obvious flaws that it can immediately be challenged in the courts. Elaborate and tricky formulas provide no answer for a more basic question: Why in a nation with compulsory, universal public education are so many people, Negro and white, illiterate? And why should there be a premium on illiteracy in some States and not in others?

THE ART OF OMISSION

(STROM THURMOND, U.S. Senator from South Carolina, reports to the people)

The President's address to Congress and the Nation, on the evening of March 15, 1965, deserves the thoughtful examination and evaluation of every American. The course he set for the Government may well determine the fate of the Nation.

The President told the Nation that the denial of voting rights to Negro citizens in Selma, Ala., had demonstrated the need for a new law.

The President did not tell the Nation that on February 4, 1965, a Federal court, acting under the Civil Rights Acts of 1960 and 1964, had made it possible for all Negroes who could read and write in Dallas County, in which Selma is located, to register and vote in the next election, and that the court order provided that the Federal voting referee, already appointed by the court, would register all who wanted to register and were not registered by July 1965.

The President told the Nation that present law could not secure the ballot for Negro citizens.

The President did not tell the Nation that in Selma, Ala., itself, the right to vote in the next election had already been insured under existing law for all Negroes who could read and write. He did not tell the Nation that there are already 16 Federal laws, 6 criminal and 10 civil, on the books to protect voting rights, including laws to protect voting rights of minorities enacted in 1957, in 1960, and in 1964. He did not tell the Nation that the Civil Rights Act of 1960 already provides for the appointment of Federal voting referees.

The President told the Nation that the only way for a person to qualify to register to vote in Alabama was to present a "white" face.

The President did not tell the Nation that there are already 115,000 Negroes registered to vote in Alabama, more than 20 percent of the vote cast in the 1960 Presidential election.

The President told the Nation that his proposed law would strike down State literacy requirements for voters.

The President did not tell the Nation that as late as 1959 the Supreme Court, itself, upheld the constitutional power of the States to impose literacy requirements for voters.

The President told the Nation that the 15th amendment to the Constitution prohibited the denial of the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The President did not tell the Nation that the 15th amendment is self-executing—that is, that it can be enforced by the courts without any legislation being passed by the Congress. He did not tell the Nation that article I, section 2 of the Constitution provides that those who may vote to elect Members of the U.S. House of Representatives are those who shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, or that this exact language is used again in the 17th amendment, which provides who shall be eligible to vote in elections of Senators.

The President told the Nation that Congress had the right to pass legislation enforcing the 15th amendment.

The President did not tell the Nation that the 15th amendment did not repeal the constitutional right of the people of each State to establish qualifications for voting, and that any law passed by Congress purporting to supersede those qualifications, as does the law proposed by the President, is patently unconstitutional.

The President told the Nation that people have a right to demonstrate and that he would use the full power of the National Government to protect that right.

The President did not tell the Nation that although all Negroes in Selma, Ala., who could read and write were already insured of the right to vote, that thousands of people from all over the country, led by an outsider, had conducted mass public demonstrations for over 8 weeks completely disrupting the affairs of peaceful and law-abiding citizens. He did not tell the Nation that the agitation was designed by its leader primarily to induce violence, which would in turn provide headlines and money-raising potential across the country, and not to secure the right to vote.

The President told the Nation that his legislation would override State eligibility requirements wherever 50 percent of eligible voters are not registered to vote or did not vote.

The President did not tell the Nation that his voting law formula is so drawn that it would apply to the entirety of six States, five of which just happen to have cast their electoral votes against him in the election last fall, and in some of which, such as South Carolina, there have been no restrictions and no complaints whatever against registration and voting of any qualified person.

I oppose the denial of the right to vote to any qualified citizen, but I oppose just as adamantly any attempted power grab by the President and Congress, which defies the Constitution, and I oppose most of all any submission by the Government to lawless mob rule and invitations by the Government to anarchy.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

RESOLUTIONS ON CARE FOR ELDER CITIZENS AND THE RIGHT-TO-WORK PRINCIPLE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce of Tyler, Tex., the home of the annual and beautiful rose festival, has recently adopted two resolutions on matters of legislative concern to Congress.

I am pleased to note that I am in complete agreement with the members of the Tyler Chamber of Commerce in their support of the eldercare bill and retention of the Texas right-to-work law. In order that other Senators may be advised of the views of Tyler citizens in these areas, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING ADEQUATE CARE FOR ELDER CITIZENS

All public spirited citizens are concerned about the best way to provide adequate health care to citizens over 65 years of age. The 1963 Report of the President's Council on Aging and other studies of the problem indicate that elderly people as a group do not experience severe problems in this area. Over 60 percent of the 18 million elderly in the United States carry some form of voluntary prepayment health insurance; 72 percent of Texas elderly citizens are so covered. However, there are many citizens who do need help such as those on old age assistance, or others who become burdened beyond their ability in meeting the costs of major illness, etc. Those who need assistance, and only those, can get it under the Kerr-Mills law passed in 1960. The Texas constitution was amended in November 1964, so as to increase the benefits obtainable under this 1960 law, by those needy and elderly in Texas. It gives aid only to those in need whereas the social security approach assures aid to all employed, when they become ill in elder-years, regardless of need and at much greater cost to all.

Aid to those in need under the proposed Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965, would consist of medical, surgical, dental, hospital, nursing home, and drug benefits rather than being limited to hospital and nursing home care. State and Federal funds would be provided on a sliding scale basis, to persons aged 65 or older who are in need, as defined by their incomes, the defining limits being set by the individual States. Recipients would obtain policies providing a wide spectrum of medical, surgical, and hospital benefits from health insurance companies or from Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans. Under the proposal an individual would pay all, part, or none of the cost of the policy, depending upon his total income. Individuals whose incomes are under specified minimums would have the entire cost of the policy paid by the State agency that would administer the program. Eligibility for benefits would be determined solely by use of a simple information return in which the applicant would list his income from all sources.

The Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965 would thus maintain the basic principles that persons 65 years old or older who need help in paying for health care should receive help, but only they; that maximum responsibility and authority for providing such help should be retained by the States; that funds from the Federal source should be from general tax revenues; and that voluntary health insurance and prepayment principles should be utilized whenever possible.

All this is in sharp contrast with the proposed King-Anderson medicare principle of a compulsory health insurance plan whereby social security taxes or payroll taxes on all ages of working citizens, would provide certain limited hospital and nursing home benefits to the elderly: Therefore be it

Resolved, That (1) the Tyler Chamber of Commerce favors the enactment by Congress of the proposed Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965 and opposes the pending King-Anderson bill in Congress or other like measures, (2) the appropriate officers of the Tyler Chamber of Commerce shall transmit this resolution to appropriate Texas Members of the U.S. Congress and to others as they deem it advisable.

(Adopted in the regular stated meeting of the board of directors at Tyler, Tex., Mar. 17, 1965.)

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE RIGHT-TO-WORK PRINCIPLE

Whereas there now is before the Congress of the United States proposals aimed at repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, which reads as follows:

"Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law."

Whereas this proposition is a fundamental part of the laws of Texas as enacted in 1947 by the legislature in reliance upon section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and which reads as follows:

"ARTICLE 5207A, VERNON'S ANNOTATED TEXAS CIVIL STATUTES

"SECTION 1. The inherent right of a person to work and bargain freely with his employer, individually or collectively, for terms and conditions of his employment shall not be denied or infringed by law, or by any organization of whatever nature.

"SEC. 2. No person shall be denied employment on account of membership or nonmembership in a labor union."

Whereas the system of free enterprise is peculiarly and especially a cherished American tradition, applying alike to the business enterprise and to the individual, to the employee and to the employer; and

Whereas these principles have been stated over and over again in many acts of social legislation, as for example in the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 which states that it shall be unlawful for an employer to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin: Therefore be it

Resolved, That (1) the Tyler Chamber of Commerce endorses and supports the right-to-work principle believing that the freedom of an individual to choose whether or not to belong to a labor union is a fundamental right that should be protected, (2) the appropriate officers of the Tyler Chamber shall transmit this resolution to appropriate Members of the U.S. Congress urging the retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act as a basic law of the land.

(Adopted by the board of directors at its regular stated meeting Mar. 17, 1965, at Tyler, Tex.)

FUNDS FOR CONTROL OF PREDATORS AND RODENTS—RESOLUTION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Texas has adopted a concurrent resolution on a most important matter about which I believe other Senators would want to be informed.

The legislature has expressed its grave concern about plans to curtail the Federal funds utilized by the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife in State-Federal, matching-fund programs designed to control predators and rodents. The budget for this vital work in our State was cut $31,000—from $206,000 to $175,000. The overall budget for the U.S. effort was cut $350,000—from $2,731,000 to $2,381,000.

I fully concur in the request by the legislature that the predator and rodent control program be continued and fully supported by Federal funds. I am certain that the program will continue to receive the help and financial support it always has received from Texas sportsmen, ranchers, and stockmen, and from the Texas Legislature.

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

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41

Whereas the State of Texas, through Texas A. & M. University cooperates with the U.S. Department of the Interior in the control of wolves, coyotes, mountain lions, bobcats, and other predatory animals and rodents with funds appropriated out of the State treasury when matched by the Congress; and

Whereas ranchers, stockmen, county commissioners, courts, livestock organizations, and wolf clubs financially support the program individually and collectively to prevent depredations upon their livestock; and

Whereas the State of Texas has supported the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife and its predecessor agencies; and

Whereas the control of predatory animals in Texas has increased the game supply to the extent that it now provides revenue for the landowners and sport for an ever increasing number of sportsmen; and

Whereas control of certain wild animals is necessary for the prevention of rabies in humans, wildlife, and livestock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas, the House of Representatives concurring, That the legislature of Texas express its approval of the request by the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife for the continuation of the predator and rodent control program, which has effectively aided sportsmen, ranchers, stockmen, and the general economy, and oppose any reduction or lessening of adequate support thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the U.S. Senators from Texas, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the dean of the Texas delegation in the U.S. House of Representatives.

PRESTON SMITH,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.

RESOLUTION ON BRACERO LABOR

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the League of United Latin American Citi-

zens of San Antonio has recently adopted a resolution concerning bracero labor. In order that the entire Senate may share the views of council No. 2 on this important issue, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States proposed legislation for the importation of bracero laborers from Mexico; and

Whereas the contention by the proponents of this legislation that the domestic stoop labor force is inadequate, is false and a subterfuge; and

Whereas Lulac Council No. 2 is well aware that there are now in Texas thousands of unemployed migratory farm laborers; more than sufficient to meet the needs of all employers, farmers and growers and the only reason why this availability of domestic labor force is not being utilized is the refusal of these employers, farmers and growers to pay decent wages; and

Whereas the true effect of the proposed legislation is to subject the thousands of Americans of Mexican descent whose livelihood depends on this type of work to starvation wages and a substandard way of living wholly incompatible with decency and health. That the American of Mexican descent of the State of Texas pleads for an opportunity for economic growth and for a full share in the participation of the new society: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Lulac Council No. 2 does hereby oppose any and all proposed legislation calling for the importation of bracero laborers or the importation of any other labor force and petitions our Congressmen and Senators to actively work and vote for the defeat of this legislation. That copies of this resolution be mailed to Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Senator JOHN TOWER, and U.S. Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ.

(Adopted at a regular meeting of Lulac Council No. 2 on Friday, March 5, 1965.)

ALEX ALCOCER,
President, Lulac Council No. 2.
PETE TIJERINA,
Chairman, Lulac Council No. 2.

RESOLUTION URGING RELAXATION OF LIMITS ON VETERANS' INCOMES FOR ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE PENSIONS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, recently I received a most thoughtful resolution adopted by Galveston Barracks No. 1447, of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

So that other Senators may share the views of the members of Barracks No. 1447, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GALVESTON BARRACKS NO. 1447,
VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A.

The following resolution was adopted on March 11, 1965, by Galveston (Tex.) Barracks No. 1447, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.:

"Whereas existing legislation (sec. 503 of title 38, U.S.C.) sets limits on war veterans' incomes for eligibility to draw the veterans pension well below the poverty level now recognized as a basic for economic opportunity needs;

"Whereas many pensioners and annuitants, because of the poverty income level set by existing law, are not eligible to enjoy the benefits of cost-of-living increases granted to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment or similar type plans or programs, and some veterans must either forego or waive such paid-in benefits as those offered under certain public or private retirement plans; and

Whereas veterans with only the small pension for support find themselves in utterly dire circumstances and are all but humiliated by a Government pledged to give reasonable recognition for services rendered in the interest of national security: Be it

"*Resolved,* That either the aforementioned income limitation be raised to more reasonable levels, so as to remove the poverty penalty and stigma, or that a law be enacted by the Congress to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from consideration as income for the purpose of determining pension eligibility, all amounts paid to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar type plans or programs. (Attention is invited to H.R. 5677, already offered and scheduled for study by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is recommended that this bill be amended to afford relief for veterans who are ineligible for retirement pay under programs other than the pension legislation.)"

MORRIS H. MILLER,
Commander.
DONALD J. NELSON,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTION URGING THE PRESIDENT AND OTHER OFFICIALS TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS OF ALABAMA TO ASSEMBLE AND VOTE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. MCCARTHY] and myself, I present a resolution, adopted by the Senate of the State of Minnesota, urging the President, the Vice President, and the Attorney General of the United States and the Governor of Alabama to protect the rights of citizens of Alabama to assemble and to vote. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 5

Resolution urging the President, Vice President, and Attorney General of the United States and the Governor of Alabama to protect the rights of citizens of Alabama to assemble and to vote

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

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

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

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

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

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

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Nicholas Katzenbach, the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable George C. Wallace, the Governor of Alabama, and Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

CY TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today is the 144th anniversary of Greek independence. It is a happy occasion for the people of Greece, and for all who love freedom.

Our form of government in the United States is, in large part, derived from the Greeks. Our democratic system is based largely on the principles laid down by the great Greek philosophers and statesmen of ancient times. The founders of our country, notably Hamilton and Washington, were greatly influenced by the ideals of freedom, liberty, and national independence practiced by the statesmen of ancient Greece.

In the largest sense, the whole Western World is indebted to Greece for the enlightenment of man and the advancement of civilization.

Greece began its inspiring history when she threw off the chains of subservience to the Ottoman Empire on March 25, 1821. Archbishop Germanos of Patras joyously raised the flag of freedom over the monastery of Kalavrita at the end of the bitter 6-year Greek War of Independence.

From 1827, when free Greece elected Demetrios Capodistrias as President, the nation has built slowly but surely against the heavy odds of poverty and wars.

Greeks and Americans often have stood together when freedom and peace were threatened. In World War II, the outnumbered Greek Army helped defeat Mussolini's Fascist legions.

Americans and Greeks fought shoulder to shoulder when they defeated the Communist attempt to subjugate Greece. As a nation, Greece has strengthened the Western alliance far out of proportion to its size and its 8 million population,

and has fought communism longer than any other nation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

America owes much to Greece for the important roles that one and a half million Americans of Hellenic background have played in our society. They have distinguished themselves in every area of human endeavor, from cancer specialist to military hero, from musician to congenial restauranteur.

Today, Greece's ideals of liberty and justice, which have never been destroyed by force of tyranny and aggression, continue to offer hope and inspiration to all people of the world wanting to be free.

THOMAS W. MILLER, ONE OF NEVADA'S MOST DISTINGUISHED CITIZENS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, last week's American Legion convention in Washington, D.C., brought one of the more colorful leading figures in Nevada to the Capital. Thomas W. Miller, of Reno, a member of the Legion's national executive committee, is not only one of Nevada's most distinguished citizens but also is among the oldest living former Representatives from the State of Delaware.

Mr. Miller is currently serving as chairman of the Reno Park Commission, only one of the many public services he has performed for my State since moving to Nevada in 1934.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a February 20 news story published in the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal describing the career of Mr. Miller.

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

EX-CONGRESSMEN KEEP INTEREST IN PUBLIC LIFE: MILLER BOSSES PARKS IN RENO

(By Tom Greer)

The five living former U.S. Representatives from Delaware share some common background characteristics.

All are native Delawareans, four of them Wilmingtonians. All are Republicans. Four served as commissioned officers during wartime.

They share another characteristic: a continuing taste for public life. Each pursued a career in some facet of government or politics after ending his service in the House of Representatives.

The lives of these five former lawmakers will be examined in a series of articles, beginning today with that of the eldest.

It has been 50 years since Thomas W. Miller, 78, went to Washington as U.S. Representative from Delaware but the half century hasn't dulled his zest for public service.

Miller lives in Reno now and he's as sharp as a needle from a Nevada cactus—or a leaf of Delaware holly. He is well informed about Delaware affairs, as well as those in his adopted State.

"I subscribe to the Wilmington Morning News," he said in a [redacted] conversation recently. "I realize you're not related to the late A. O. H. Grier (veteran News-Journal editor and writer) by the spelling of your name. [redacted]

"The death of my good friend Senator C. Douglass Buck was a great shock. I feel a deep sense of tragedy, for I grew up with him," he added in the next breath.

On another tack, still in the same 30 seconds: "I see my friend Bill Frank went to Panama. Say hello to Bill for me."

Born in Wilmington June 26, 1886, Thomas Woodnutt Miller is the son of the late Charles R. Miller, a former Delaware Governor. He attended public schools here and graduated from Yale University in 1908.

He served as secretary to Representative William H. Heald, of Delaware, 1910–12, and during that period studied law in Washington. He was Secretary of State of Delaware from 1913 to 1915.

When he was elected U.S. Representative in 1914 he was the youngest elected to the 64th Congress. Part of his single 1915–17 term coincided with his father's term as Governor.

Harking back to his congressional years, Miller recalls that with the advent of World War I, companies trading in munitions with the Allies came under attack on the floor. One such incident occurred in December 1915, when Representative Clyde H. Tavenner, Democrat, of Illinois, renewed his attacks, with particular reference to the Du Pont Co. Miller said that in one of his initial remarks on the House floor, he replied so vigorously that Speaker Champ Clark sent the sergeant at arms with his mace to separate the two Congressmen.

In another instance, Miller said he engaged in a floor fight supporting the Du Pont Co. when an embargo bill that would have prevented munitions shipments to the Allies was being debated. Representative Dorsey W. Shackleford, Democrat, of Missouri, was needling Miller for his opposition to the bill. "The gentleman from Delaware represents a State with three counties when the tide is out and two when it is in," said Shackleford.

Miller replied, in part: "He (Shackleford) has to impute unfair motives to me but he was perfectly willing to have an embargo on everything else except the great Missouri mule, the animal that hauls the engines of war."

Miller was identified early with the preparedness movement and was one of the originators of the military training camps program. He served his own military apprenticeship at Plattsburgh, N.Y., barracks in 1915.

It wasn't all work in Washington, though. Miller was a member of the Republican congressional baseball team, pitching and playing right field. In the 1916 game in Washington—which the Republicans won 9 to 6—he caught the ball thrown out by President Woodrow Wilson.

Miller recalled that he placed in nomination the name of Gen. T. Coleman du Pont as Delaware's favorite son presidential candidate at the Republican National Convention in Chicago in June 1916. He said that Du Pont received a smattering of complimentary votes from a half-dozen other States.

When the United States entered World War I in 1917, Miller enlisted as a private in the infantry. He rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel, was cited for gallantry and meritorious conduct and awarded the Purple Heart.

After the war he was a cofounder and an incorporator of the American Legion, serving as vice president and presiding officer of the Paris caucus, at which the Legion came into being.

Miller is the only man in the Nation to have held the highest Legion post in two States. He was State department commander of Delaware in 1932–33 and held the same office in Nevada in 1943–44.

He was also a member of the Legion's national executive committee from Delaware, from 1919–28, and still serves in a similar capacity from Nevada.

Long having had interests in mining and ranching, Miller moved to Nevada in 1934, where he became active in that State's conservation movement. He is the originator of the Nevada parks system and served as chairman of the Nevada State Park Commission until his official retirement in 1959.

He is now chairman of the City of Reno Park and Horticultural Commission, a member of the Washoe County Republican Committee, a member of the board of the desert protective council (a conservation group), a member of the home service committee of the Red Cross, a junior warden and vestryman of Trinity Episcopal Church, Reno.

Miller likes to travel and hunt big game, "Deer and elk mostly, and sage hen sometimes," he says identifying the last as western game bird.

Miller goes to the park and horticultural commission offices in Reno's city hall every day, he said, and also has a private office in the park.

Miller was married to Katherine Marie Tallman in Wilmington, October 4, 1913. A year after her death in 1945, he married Eleanor Taylor, of Reno. There are two children by his first marriage, Comdr. Thomas Lloyd Miller, U.S. Navy, retired, of Miami, Fla., and Stonington, Conn.; and Mrs. George P. Bissell, Jr., of Greenville. He has six grandchildren, the eldest of whom is Russell Tallman Miller, a resident of Nevada and the father of the elder Miller's two great-grandchildren.

Miller returned to Wilmington briefly last summer and while here, culled from his stored personal papers those he considered worth keeping. He is well known in Delaware and has many friends here, although he has outlived many of his contemporaries in Delaware politics.

Miller now is busy with plans for his annual trip to Washington next month as chairman of the American Legion's national legislative liaison committee.

"I'm looking forward to entertaining the Delaware congressional delegation again, just as I do every year when I go to Washington.

"I'll be in Delaware, too. I'll look you up," he said.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY—MARCH 25

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, March 25, 1965, is the 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day—reminding all of us of the dedicated patriots of Greece who rose in the cause of freedom in 1821, and successfully gained liberty from foreign domination for the nation that has been the Western World's cradle of democracy.

This revolution against 4 centuries of oppression, was a resounding echo of the American Revolution; one which stirred the minds and hearts of men throughout the world.

Americans, still conscious of their own great struggle, joined the movement. President Monroe said in a message to the Congress that, "It is natural, therefore, that their—the Greeks—contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

The feeling was not one-sided. One of the first acts of the Greek Senate in May 1821, was an address directed to the American people stating, "Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue."

Our two Republics have maintained this close relationship throughout the years. Time has passed, but former victories have not guided us to the millennium. We still feel the cold winds from behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

We still must maintain our vigilance in these strained times. Together with such firm allies as Greece, I am confident we will eventually prevail.

I salute the people of Greece on this important anniversary of their independence. It is a day of meaning for all people who hold liberty sacred.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes in the morning hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin withhold his request until morning business has been concluded? He can then use his 5 minutes at that time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to oblige the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senate, I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

INTERNATIONAL BALANCE OF PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has been holding a series of hearings on the international balance-of-payments problem. Some of the papers presented at the hearing have been so helpful and informative that I believe that at least in part they should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress because so many of our decisions are governed by our concern for the Nation's balance-of-payments dilemma.

One of the most interesting papers was submitted by Prof. Richard N. Cooper of Yale University.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement written by Mr. Cooper.

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

STATEMENT FOR THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MARCH 18, 1965, BY RICHARD N. COOPER, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, YALE UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very pleased to appear before you. I have been asked to talk on the competitive position of the United States and its relationship to the balance of payments. My observations will necessarily overlap to some extent with those you have just heard from Mr. Salant, but I hope the overlap will not be too great.

When we speak about the competitive position of a country, or the competitiveness of its products in world markets, we are attempting to assess how well that country is doing in international trade, relative both to its own past and to the performance of other countries. I intend first to say something about the competitive performance of the United States, then to discuss several of the dimensions of competitiveness which I think are especially important, and finally to ask whether we can rely on further improvements in our competitive position to solve the balance-of-payments problem which currently confronts this country.

I

There is no question about the basic strength of America's competitive position. Total exports of goods and services from the United States reached $36.5 billion in 1964, far higher than had ever been recorded before for this or any other country. The United States provided over one-sixth of total world exports of merchandise. This country is of course also a heavy importer, and American imports of goods and services have grown by over $5 billion since 1960, paralleling the remarkable expansion of our gross national product. Despite this rapid rise in imports, however, the surplus of exports of goods and services over imports of goods and services has risen in every year since 1959, except for a slight fall in 1962; and in 1964 this surplus stood at $8.1 billion the highest in our history except for the Second World War years of 1943 and 1944 and the postwar year of 1947 when the United States was exporting heavily to Europe and importing very little. Of this surplus, $6.5 billion was provided by merchandise alone, and the remainder reflected for the most part our large earnings on foreign investment.

These figures apply to total exports of goods and services, including those financed by the American Government as part of our foreign aid program and those exports resulting from special government-to-government arrangements concerning the purchase of military equipment. If we make adjustments for these sales, the size of the surplus declines, but the sharp and steady improvement over the past few years remains. On the definitions of the U.S. Treasury Department, our commercial surplus grew from $3.7 billion in 1960 to $5.9 billion in 1964.

A substantial part of the growth in American exports and even in the growth of the trade surplus can be explained, of course, simply by the growth in world trade, which has been exceptionally rapid in recent years, rising in 1964 to $151 billion, 12 percent above a year earlier. American exports have naturally participated in this rapid growth. At the same time, the U.S. economy, being relatively mature, has been growing more slowly than many countries abroad, and U.S. imports have thus failed to grow as rapidly as world imports.

Recently, however, American exports have grown even more rapidly than total world exports, and hence the U.S. share of world exports has increased slightly, after declining for many years. Analysis of export shares has become so fashionable these days that one tends to forget its limitations: the strong influence of the particular dates chosen for comparison, the paradoxical possibility that a country's export share can rise in every one of its markets and still decline in total, the implicit but inappropriate normative implication that maintaining one's share in world markets is crucial or even important. There are several reasons for believing that the U.S. share of world exports both would and should decline somewhat over time. The formation of large discriminatory free trade areas, such as the European Common Market, the European Free Trade Association, and the Latin American Free Trade Association, would naturally lead to a decline in America's share of world exports (though not necessarily in the total value of exports), as intraregional trade expands in response to lower internal trade barriers. Moreover, as incomes in the less developed countries of today rise, and as their economies become able to provide a wider range of goods of reasonable cost and quality, trade among them can be expected to increase. It is now extraordinarily low, accounting for less than 10 percent of world trade. This increase would be a salutary development, but it would lower U.S. export shares.

In spite of these reasons for some decline in American export shares, however, the share of American exports increased in 8 of 10 areas around the globe between the first half of 1963 and the first half of 1964, the latest period for which complete trade figures are available. Moreover, the slight decline in the U.S. share of imports into Japan * * * was due, not to inroads from competitors in the European Common Market, but to a rising Japanese demand for materials from the less developed countries. Indeed, export shares of the European Common Market declined in a number of important regions during the same period.

These figures, taken all together, do not mark a country with a weak or a deteriorating competitive position. On the contrary, to many foreigners the competitive position of the United States is disconcertingly strong and is improving at an alarming rate, a theme to which I will return below.

II

If we look behind these indicators of competitive performance to the various factors which determine or influence the competitiveness of a country's products, we find evidence which is somewhat more difficult to evaluate. Competitive performance is determined by a number of factors—price, quality, design, delivery time, credit terms, servicing arrangements, and, not least, vigor of salesmanship. It is often difficult to determine which factors govern any particular sale.

There is, however, one dimension of competitiveness in which American performance has been unambiguously excellent, and that is price and, underlying price, costs. Wholesale prices of industrial goods are only half a percent higher today than they were in 1959. Prices of intermediate industrial materials, important in American exports, have actually fallen since 1959, and prices of producer finished goods have risen by only 2½ percent. These price movements compare very favorably with price trends abroad. Since 1959 wholesale prices of industrial products rose 15 percent in France, 12 percent in Italy, 9 percent in Netherlands, 16 percent in Sweden, and 12 percent in the United Kingdom. Only Canada, Germany, and Japan maintained price records comparable to that of the United States, and German prices have begun to rise significantly during the past year.

These trends are quite different from those which prevailed in the preceding 5 years, 1954 to 1959. During that period U.S. prices rose substantially more than those of its major competitors, and the American export position weakened accordingly.

Comparisons of movements in domestic wholesale prices do not represent an ideal measure of price competitiveness, for two somewhat conflicting reasons. First, the the coverage of domestic wholesale prices does not represent accurately the composition of a country's exports—it is too broad in some respects, too narrow in others, and it often includes the prices of imported goods. For the purposes of assessing changes in our price competitiveness we badly need an accurate index of export prices, as we recommended some years ago in the Stigler report to the Budget Bureau on "The Price Statistics of the Federal Government." We can get a very rough indication of export price performance, however, from figures compiled by the United Nations on the "unit value of exports of manufactures" from the major exporting nations. These show less divergence from country to country than do the movements in wholesale prices of industrial products, as might be expected given the stiff competition in the international markets. Nonetheless, the export "unit values" have risen more rapidly in most

major countries during the past few years than they have for the United States. The major exceptions, again, are Canada, whose devaluations in 1961 and 1962 lowered export unit values about 8 percent, and Japan, which has manifested steadily falling export prices.

The second defect in wholesale price indexes as a measure of price competitiveness is the one to which I just alluded: In a highly competitive world wholesale prices cannot diverge much from country to country. It is necessary therefore to undertake the more difficult task of examining movements in costs rather than prices. Here again the U.S. performance has been good. Hourly earnings of workers in industry rose only 19 percent in the United States between 1958 and 1964, compared with increases of 29 percent in Belgium and Britain, 56 percent in France, 58 percent in Germany, 61 percent in the Netherlands, 70 percent in Italy, and 70 percent in Japan. These vast differences in wage increases reflect largely, of course, differences in the growth in productivity from country to country. But when allowance is made for that, labor costs rose substantially less in the United States than they did in most other countries. A recent study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that between 1959 and 1962 labor costs per unit of output in manufacturing rose by only 2 percent in the United States, compared with 13 percent in Britain, 23 percent in Germany, 9 percent in Japan, and so on. Wage increases have been outstripping increases in productivity handsomely in most countries since 1962, so this trend toward higher costs abroad has continued.

It is sometimes suggested that comparisons of percentage increases for wages are not appropriate, since foreign wage levels are so much lower than they are in the United States. Thus a 10-percent increase in $1 per hour is absolutely less than a 5-percent increase in $2.54 per hour, which was the average hourly earning in U.S. manufacturing industries in 1964. This observation is arithmetically correct, but it is analytically incorrect. Broadly speaking, the level of wages in each country reflects its productivity; if wages are higher in the United States than elsewhere, that is because productivity is also higher.

I once estimated average productivity per man-hour in manufacturing for a number of countries for the year 1959 and found it to vary from $3.89 in the United States to about $0.40 in Japan, with the European countries clustered around $1 per hour.[1] Japanese firms cannot, of course, afford to pay their workers even $0.75 per hour if their average net output is only $0.40 per hour. Productivity abroad has gone up rapidly since 1959, so these figures are now somewhat out of date. But the basic point remains that relative movements in unit labor costs are the result of relative changes in wages and productivity, not of absolute changes in wages. If the general level of wages rises by the same percentage in two countries and productivity remains unchanged, the rise in unit labor costs will generally be the same regardless of disparities in the wage levels.

As the preceding observations indicate, American performance in the areas of price and cost competitiveness has been very good during the past few years, the compound effect of stability at home and rising prices and costs abroad. Recently some analysts have become alarmed by the very sharp rise in certain raw materials prices which has taken place during the past 15 months, and have suggested that this rise in prices may threaten the ability of American exports to compete in world markets. I would like to suggest, to the contrary, that the rise in materials prices, by itself, will help rather than hurt the U.S. balance of payments. There are four reasons for this. The first and most obvious, but possibly the least important, is that the United States is itself a substantial exporter of industrial materials and therefore benefits directly, in the short run, from higher prices for such products as aluminum, sulfur, phosphates, oilseeds, and so on. Europe and Japan, by contrast, export only very small amounts of industrial materials and import them heavily.

Second, higher materials prices mean higher foreign exchange receipts to primary producing countries, including Canada as well as many less developed countries. In the past these countries have spent a higher-than-average share of increases in earnings on purchases from the United States. This should be considered in conjunction with the fact that Europe and Japan together are much larger importers of industrial materials than is the United States, so most of the additional earnings of the primary producing countries will come from Europe and Japan. And, of course, earnings on U.S. investments in primary producing countries will rise.

Third, some evidence suggests that a given rise in prices of industrial materials will raise the manufacturing costs of our major competitors more than it will raise U.S. manufacturing costs, because materials account for a larger share of total unit costs abroad than in the United States. A survey of comparable firms in the United States and abroad by the National Industrial Conference Board showed materials accounting for an average of 46 percent of total manufacturing costs in the European Common Market, for instance, compared with 32 percent in this country.[2] Similar relationships prevailed for other countries. (For the same reason, Europe benefited substantially from the weakness in primary product prices following 1960, for this helped offset the gradual rise in labor costs there. Merely halting the fall in materials prices therefore increased the cost pressures on European firms.)

Finally, when materials prices do rise they tend to rise more rapidly in international markets, where European purchases are made, than in the tariff-sheltered and largely domestically supplied market in the United States. This factor will put still further pressures on European and Japanese costs in a period of rising prices.

Putting all these factors together, higher materials prices should strengthen the U.S. trade position, even after allowing for the higher prices which American firms would admittedly have to pay for their own imports of raw materials.

I have dealt at some length on price and cost factors in our competitive position. A number of economists are inclined to give these second place in importance compared with the "quality" of American goods and in particular with the invention and production of new and advanced products. According to this line of argument, the United States draws its export strength in manufactures not so much from lower prices and costs as from a continual outpouring of new and advanced products which are not available elsewhere—from a "technological lead" which gives the United States a momentary advantage until other countries begin to produce identical or competing goods. And by that time Americans have devised still newer and better products.

In terms of this argument, the weakening competitive position of the United States during the 1950's can be explained by an erosion of this technological lead. Other countries began to develop new products themselves, and they began to produce new American products more quickly after their development here. It is not difficult to appreciate the reasons for any diminution of America's technological lead which may have taken place. Other countries have become highly alert to the benefits of research and development expenditures and to advanced technical education, and they have stepped up their program in both areas. France quite explicitly bases a part of its case for maintaining an atomic weapons program—and for its joint efforts with Britain to produce the supersonic airliner Concorde—on the "technological fallout" which large programs such as this can generate. Countries which want to remain in the technological forefront feel they must have active and popular programs which attract high quality personnel to the technological frontier and keep them there. I do not pass judgment on these arguments, but only note that they are given important considerations abroad. The concern of Britain and others about the "brain drain" arises in part from the same considerations.

A second factor tending to reduce the technological lead of the United States is the very rapid growth in American direct investment abroad, especially in Europe. Direct investment outflows from the United States to Europe have grown from $190 million in 1958 to over $1,200 million in 1964. With American capital go American management skills and American know-how. Indeed, increasingly these factors have been exported even in the absence of direct investment in productive facilities abroad. In 1964 the U.S. earned about $1 billion in royalties and fees for rights to produce patented American products, for technical and managerial advice from American firms, and the like. Only two-thirds of these receipts came from U.S. subsidiaries abroad. We are engaging increasingly in the export of knowledge per se, disembodied from American goods and from American capital.

I regard this as one of the most far reaching of recent developments in international trade. While the U.S. benefits directly from the sale of this knowledge, such sales do cut the technological lead of American industry further and increase foreign competition with many American products. It is worth recalling that exporting knowledge was not always so easy. In medieval Europe severe restrictions were often placed on the movements of skilled craftsmen, lest they take their trade secrets to rival cities. And it was not until 1843 that Britain removed its prohibition on the export of machinery, especially textile machinery—a prohibition designed to preserve Britain's primacy as a manufacturing center by withholding up-to-date capital equipment from would-be foreign competitors. A legacy of these limitations on the movement of technical knowledge is found today in our own restrictions on exports to the Soviet bloc, which extend well beyond materials of direct military value.

The recent improvement in the American competitive position has taken place despite increasing attention abroad to the application of new technology. I do not know how to assess the net value to the United States in the long run of exporting our technology. Certainly from a global viewpoint it is desirable. But it may reduce our export sales of some products.

There are many other dimensions of competitiveness. I will say something briefly about only one more, credit terms, because it is a dimension of competitiveness which is of particular interest to this Committee. The level of interest rates and credit availability which we maintain in this country influence among other things the cost of export credit. A rise in interest rates at home will stiffen the credit terms which American exporters offer their customers. British exporters have castigated Britain's frequent reliance on

[1] "International Aspects of Technical Change," in Automation, John T. Dunlop (editor), the American Assembly, 1962.

[2] Theodore Gates and Fabian Linden, "Costs and Competition," National Industrial Conference Board, 1961.

increases in interest rates for this reason. A report by the Federation of British Industries points out that "it is a disagreeable paradox that steps to protect the currency at a time of crisis in the balance of payments can in themselves increase the difficulties of expanding exports," and urges the British Government to pursue a policy of lower and more stable interest rates.[3]

So far, being able to offer favorable credit terms has aided American exporters. The rise in American interest rates over the last year and a half may not have impeded exports much because foreign interest rates have also risen. To that extent, however, the United States did not improve its balance-of-payments position by raising interest rates either.

Some countries attempt to mitigate the deleterious effect of higher interest rates and tighter credit on exports by providing special facilities for export credit, such as the rediscounting privileges for export paper at the central banks in France and Italy and the French exemption for export credit from the 10-percent credit ceilings which have been imposed since September 1963. While these measures are easy to understand—the United States has taken steps to ensure that the interest equalization tax will not limit exports—we should avoid pursuing the dangerous and self-defeating path in which one country after another tightens credit and then introduces special rates for export credit which represent in effect, export subsidies, since they provide domestic firms an incentive to sell abroad rather than at home. Such a policy would be costly to growth without benefit to the balance of payments.

III

As I have already indicated, the U.S. trade position is very strong, it has been improving, and at least some of the factors which determine a country's competitive position continue to work in favor of further improvement. That is good, and it is important for our balance of payments. We should avoid measures which weaken our competitive position. At the same time, I think that the emphasis currently placed on increasing exports still further as a principal means to correct the payments deficit is inappropriate. We must remember two things: the basic symmetry in international trade and the large size and relative importance of the United States in world trade. The first means that any improvement in the competitive position of the United States—any further increase in the already huge American surplus—necessarily involves a deterioration in the current account balance of the other countries. The second point means that any significant improvement in the U.S. position will be substantial in size and noticeable in the accounts of others, not negligible as it might be for improvements in the trade balance of, say, the Philippines or even of India. These countries can plan on expanding export markets without the need for others to take it much into account. The same is not true for the United States.

The underlying symmetry in international accounts and the preponderant size of the United States must be set against the attitudes which other nations have taken toward their own trade positions during the past few years. Canada, the most important trading partner of the United States, has an announced objective of reducing its dependence for external balance on capital inflows by eliminating its current account deficit—which arises largely from its transactions with the United States—over the next few years. It has already moved very far in this direction, reducing its current account deficit from $1.5 billion in 1959 to under $0.5 billion in 1964. Some Canadians point to the time when Canada would become a net exporter of capital—with a corresponding current account surplus—as would seem consistent with its wealth and per capita income.

British officials have for years spoken of the need to raise Britain's current account surplus to £300 million ($840 million)—a very large increase from the present level—to cover its large overseas financial commitments and to build up its dangerously low reserves. Japan's trade position has improved very greatly during the past year, but Japanese officials continue to be concerned with strengthening Japan's competitive position too—partly to meet new international competition as it undertakes further trade liberalization, partly to reduce its current account deficit of roughly $0.5 billion a year and to reduce its large external indebtedness.

Even the European Economic Community, whose members collectively have been accumulating reserves at an incredible rate and who have been claiming gold from the United States, has expressed alarm at the sharp deterioration in its own trade position during the past few years. The trade balance of the EEC with the rest of the world slipped from virtual balance in 1960 to a deficit of $3.0 billion in 1963 and of $2.3 billion in the first 9 months of 1964, despite the sharp downturn in Italy. Credit restraint, already severe in Italy and France, is being applied increasingly in other members of the EEC largely in response to this deterioration and to the related increase in prices.

We find the same story with other countries. Switzerland is very much worried about the vulnerability inherent in a huge current account deficit balanced—sometimes overbalanced—by a massive inflow of short-term funds. The less developed countries, too, all want to improve their export earnings; but fortunately we can count on them to spend these earnings for debt repayment or badly needed imports rather than accumulate them as reserves for more than short periods of time.

It is clear that not all countries can succeed in realizing these inconsistent objectives of expanding export earnings in relationship to import earnings at the same time. Some of them are bound to be frustrated. The United States, with its already huge surplus, is in an especially weak position to argue that it needs the improvement most. As I indicated earlier, the American surplus might in fact rise somewhat further as a result of favorable movements in costs and prices which have already taken place and will continue in the near future. But additional measures to increase it further will meet both resentment and resistence from our major trading partners. Such measures are likely to be thwarted by countermeasures taken by others to stimulate their exports, by stiff opposition to further reductions in trade barriers, and possibly even by increased barriers to trade. I do not think that we can rely on that route to solve our balance of payments problem.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, another helpful and expert witness was Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the International Economic Policy Association, which represents a number of the largest companies in this country, including companies which have invested abroad very widely.

Mr. Danielian's testimony—while I do not agree with all of it—was, I thought, helpful and explained his viewpoint and those of a number of large companies which have been responsible for increasing their investments abroad by billions of dollars in recent years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the conclusions and the recommendations of Mr. Danielian.

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

CONCLUSIONS BY N. R. DANIELIAN

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to summarize the implications of these facts and make certain recommendations.

1. It is a major error of fact to blame private capital exports, particularly direct investments abroad, for the balance of payments deficits. It is a major error in policy to try and resolve the deficits by control of private investments abroad, particularly in developed countries. About $9 billions of foreign revenues—more than one-fourth of our total external earnings, are derived from direct private investments abroad. It makes no sense as a national policy to try and retard, discourage, or control, this source of external income.

The attempt to deal with deficits through the private capital account is also based on the assumption that the balance of payments deficit is a short-term phenomenon. Our analysis of the facts indicates that it is due to the continued $7, $8 or $9 billion a year Government transfers of wealth and purchasing power abroad. As long as this continues, the deficit will not be temporary but a permanent phenomenon, and we should exert all our efforts in earning money on investments from countries that are stable and secure in their political structure and currency. This country cannot possibly meet its continuing obligations abroad by making it a habit of appropriating, year after year, billions of dollars for long-term, soft, no-interest loans and grants and military expenditures abroad, while at the same time curtailing one of the two most important sources of cash income, secure investments abroad.

2. I think the facts indicate that it is also an illusion to think that we can solve this problem by expanding exports unilaterally while we curtail investments abroad. The facts show that much of our favorable export accounts are in machinery and raw materials, mostly to developed countries, in part due to our direct investments. In other categories such as consumer end products, the trends have turned against us.

One of our easy assumptions is that we are competitive in the price of manufactures. During my extensive travels abroad, one of the first explanations given by U.S. commercial counselors for the diminishing percentage of U.S. exports in relation to total imports of other countries is noncompetitiveness in price. Of course there are items in which we are in a favorable position. But there are many products in which this is not true. Because our desire in the period after World War II was to encourage exports from the war-torn countries, we built certain biases into international agreements. For example, the GATT agreements allows the forgiveness of turnover taxes in exports, it does not allow a similar concession of income taxes. As European countries base their tax system mainly on turnover taxes, this favors the European exporter to the extent of 20 or 25 percent in export price discounts, without being accused of dumping or export subsidies, but any move by us to forgive a portion of income taxes on exported goods would be considered in violation of GATT.

There is another structural development which will inhibit U.S. exports to an increasing degree. This is the growth of common markets and free trade areas, as well as the desire of developing countries to be self-sufficient in manufactures. The very essence of common markets is to favor the members and discriminate against the nonmembers. Thus the prospects of increasing

[3] Export Incentives, 1962.

net earnings by exports of manufactured end products will be limited. The permission to establish common markets and to discriminate against nonmembers, without violating the most-favored-nation provision of GATT is another provision established in the postwar period to favor Europe.

The opportunities of solving this problem by a unilateral increase in exports of $3 billion are not good. The underdeveloped countries do not have the cash—they want foreign aid which they will use for industrial development behind protective tariff walls. The Communist countries are limited in their gold and foreign exchange resources, and the best you can hope for there is limited exports of essentials, such as grain, and barter arrangements; or long-term credits, which would not help our balance of payments.

Many of the developed countries, Japan, Canada, and Great Britain, have their own balance-of-payments deficits, and hence, are in no position to increase imports from us unilaterally. In fact, all three of these countries are trying to reduce their deficits by buying less abroad and selling more.

This leaves us with the surplus countries, mostly the EEC and Spain. It would require almost a 100-percent increase in our sales to them to increase our exports by $3 billion; or we would have to take away that much of their markets in third countries—both attempts fraught with both economic and political dangers.

Thus, we have been pursuing a national policy since 1961 which was contrary to recognizable historical trends, could not possibly have succeeded, and, by following an illusion, we have delayed other solutions of the problem of deficits.

3. The assumption that the trade negotiations under the Kennedy round will help us improve our balance-of-payments position needs such more careful scrutiny than it has received to date. The Common Market's desire is to lower our tariffs in categories of industries and products which heretofore have given us the largest trade account surplus. The very controversy on tariff disparities is designed to breach the U.S. market in those products. On the other hand, in fields such as grain exports, where we have a tremendous price advantage, we have made concessions in the Dillon round of negotiations in order to help the completion of the Common Market arrangments: in accepting the variable levies and a high price support program in the EEC, both of which threaten to diminish our exports of these products. In the area of consumer end products, I am afraid the statistical trends show the prospects of our increasing cash sales are rather dim.

Everybody seems to want our machinery for tooling up to produce their own consumer products, and it is doubtful that the current trade negotiations will change that trend. Whenever there is an opportunity to increase sales, as for instance in U.S. compact cars, the nontariff barriers put in our way are insurmountable and possibly beyond the reach of trade negotiations.

4. It is a current illusion that tied aid prevents leakage of dollars. A more careful and penetrating analysis of aid and trade will indicate, I believe, that more and more of our sales to underdeveloped countries are being shifted from cash account to credit account, and the saving in dollar exchange resulting therefrom is being spent in other countries. This is true also of the aid given by international institutions.

5. In the area of defense expenditures abroad, there has perhaps been some lag also in appreciating the significance of new technological developments. This lag is perhaps responsible for the maintenance of troops in Western Europe 20 years after the termination of hostilities. We are not, of course, in a position to make recommendations with respect to strategic military planning, but one cannot help but wonder whether there are not some alternative arrangements or choices we can offer to our allies that will diminish our out-of-pocket expenses for this purpose.

RECOMMENDATIONS

With these conclusions in mind, we would like to advance for your consideration a number of specific recommendations.

1. We should stop frightening the capital markets of the world by hints of forthcoming controls and regulations. There is nothing more sensitive in economic life than liquid capital. We must remember that, in addition to such capital held by institutions and individuals of other nations and U.S. corporations, there are millions and millions of Americans with money in the bank who may be scared into taking panic action that will bring about the very consequences we seek to avoid. We should stop frightening capital into unnecessary movements.

2. A very determined effort should be made, in addition to those already undertaken by the Defense Department and AID, to curtail Government outlays abroad by approximately $1 billion. To accomplish this, we suggest, first, converting the foreign aid program to a lend-lease basis instead of a line-of-credit basis, financing only U.S.-produced components of specific incremental development projects. This means termination of program loans, balance-of-payments loans, and budgetary assistance.

The present techniques of giving foreign aid have proved wasteful, because they finance current consumption and unproductive employment; and have added to our balance-of-payments deficits because they cause substitution of credit sales for cash sales.

Where there is absolute military necessity for balance of payments and budgetary help, then the President should be provided with sufficient contingency funds to take care of it on a case-by-case basis.

At the same time, more discriminating attention should be given to opportunities for dollar sales under title IV of Public Law 480, and for a possible amendment to title I, which would require at least 25 percent payment in hard currency. It would indeed help our balance of payments much more if we got 25 percent in dollars or other hard currencies, and made a gift of the rest, than to maintain the illusion of cash sales for local currencies.

While these changes are being worked out, we recommend at least a 20-percent cut in section 202 and 252 appropriations under the Foreign Assistance Act, immediately, and that they be phased out completely as soon as the lend-lease program is set up.

3. The United States should become more aggressive in the protection of existing markets in our trade negotiations. To accomplish this, we must cease putting undefinable political objectives ahead of clearly definable economic advantages. I believe this is the only country where there is such a separation in the minds of policymakers and diplomats.

For instance, there has been pressure in the United States to push Great Britain into the Common Market. If we do this, we are sure to lose additional agricultural sales which we can ill afford. If England should go into the Common Market, other EFTA countries will follow, and we would be discriminated against in all of them.

I suggest that while the EEC takes the next 2 or 3 years to consolidate itself, economically, we should proceed to develop a common market of our own—the Atlantic Common Market—by amending sections 211 and 251 of the Trade Expansion Act. Section 211 gives the President power to reduce tariffs on commodities in which the Common Market and the U.S. trade account for 80 percent of world trade. This provision was nothing more than an inducement to Great Britain to enter the Common Market, because no appreciable number of commodities qualified, except jet aircraft, without British membership in the EEC. That provision should now be expanded to allow bilateral negotiations with Canada, Great Britain—in fact, all Commonwealth countries—with the EFTA countries, with the Latin American Free Trade Area, the Central American Free Trade Association, and with any other countries at the discretion of the President. This revision will permit us to negotiate for the expansion of our markets in other countries around the world, instead of hanging on the ropes waiting on Mr. de Gaulle's pleasure.

This cannot be done, however, without amendment of section 251, which extends unconditional most-favored-nation treatment to all countries. This provision should be amended by making the granting of concessions conditional so that we would retain bargaining power instead of giving concessions free to the EEC. With these changes, the U.S. Government will reacquire the initiative in trade negotiations, and the attainment of an Atlantic Common Market becomes feasible. This may be the quickest way to bring about the Atlantic Community so important to Western defense.

4. Immediate steps should be taken by Export-Import Bank: (a) To stop making balance-of-payments loans as an adjunct of AID policy, and return to its original purpose of making specific project loans to encourage exports; and (b) to liberalize its export credit and insurance facilities to become completely competitive with similar facilities offered by other countries.

5. We should put the Common Market countries on notice that the United States will take steps to reduce its military expenses and tourist expenses in the balance-of-payments surplus countries by at least $1 billion unless they make an offer to purchase, additionally, from us at least that amount of incremental products by reducing their protectionist devices against U.S. agricultural products, U.S. automobiles, coal, and a variety of other products for which they have need and which we can provide at reasonable prices; and be prepared to carry it out. Another alternative they should be offered is sharing in the costs of Western defense by an equivalent amount.

6. The Congress should instruct the Executive to cease and desist from further commitments to international institutions for foreign aid, until prior authorization is obtained from the Congress. I think we should put a moratorium for a while on appropriations for no-interest, long-term, soft loans.

The Congress should also instruct, by legislation, our representatives in these institutions, particularly the World Bank and the Inter-American Bank, to vote against the issuance of bonds in the U.S. market, and insist that dollar loans be tied to U.S. procurement. It is not easy to understand how, consistently, the Congress can tell foreign borrowers not to come to the American money market and American investors to refrain from investing abroad, while these international institutions, with the faith and credit of the U.S. Government behind them, borrow in the United States, get generous appropriations, and lend untied funds to underdeveloped countries.

7. The U.S. Government should take a good hard look at the effect of international commodity agreements on U.S. balance of payments. Are international cartels, even if contrived by governments, the effect of which is to raise the price of imports, in the U.S. interest? Are commodity agreements, such as the wheat agreement, the effect of which is to share markets, rather than sell more U.S. agricultural production, to the interest of our country? Are international price

maintenance subsidies, as in sugar, to the interest of the United States? Can we not devise ways whereby, if the U.S. consumer is called upon to pay a premium price, the difference between world price and U.S. price can be set aside as a foreign aid fund, thereby diminishing the necessity of direct aid appropriations? Again, in this area, the United States faces the responsibility of developing a policy consistent with our overall commitments and interests.

8. The charters of the post-World War II international institutions should be reexamined to see whether they need amendments to bring them in line with current conditions. Established at a time when the world bias was in favor of Europe, many of these provisions now prevent the United States from taking initiatives in solving current problems.

I have already referred to two provisions of GATT, in tax treatment, and in exceptions given to EEC, which make it difficult for us to expand our exports. There are other institutions, such as the World Bank, IDA, Inter-American Bank, which need to be reviewed. This reexamination should include the proportion of U.S. participation, procurement policies, and the purposes for which funds are to be used.

Every 2 years the Congress is presented with proposed amendments, always for increased appropriations, but never with any substantiative changes in charter provisions. The next revision should concern itself with fundamental amendments of the charters of these institutions. But before going into such an effort, it is to be hoped that the Congress will find ways of studying these charters and making basic recommendations to the Executive.

I wish to thank the committee for its patience and indulgence in hearing out our extensive examination. We have devoted a great deal of time and effort in studying these problems. It is extremely heartening to us that such an important body as this committee has made this effort worthwhile by giving us this opportunity.

I must also express my personal gratitude and pleasure to our member companies which have given us the freedom to speak out the truth as we see it. The points we have made here are the results of the research and discussions of the participants here. No one else has seen or reviewed this statement, not even committees of our organization or member companies.

I do not know whether they would agree or disagree with these conclusions and recommendations. Therefore, in all fairness, I want to save them any blame, and assume full responsibility for this presentation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the London Economist has published a provocative and thoughtful editorial in this field. I should like to quote briefly from it, before asking unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

It reads:

If there is a further series of large speculative movements of funds in the gold and foreign exchange markets this year, those in the eye of the storm will be liable to recommend two policies: A new dose of illiberal restrictions abroad, even though beggar-my-neighbor policies are the precise policies that need to be avoided; and further deflation at home, even though the whole free world's economic conjuncture might by then be set on a dangerously deflationary course. Then the snowball really could start to roll.

This is not a forecast of inevitable disaster. The odds, to repeat, are still that the world will avoid a serious international financial crisis this year, not because of brilliant international economic management, but just because of the luck of the way the wind blows. It can even be argued that none of the restrictive things that have been done in the past few months—except those done by General de Gaulle—has in itself been demonstrably wrong. But it is certain that the world's chancelleries should at least be working out a contingency plan, in case the wind does blow the wrong way. The essence of it should be a determination that, if a serious threat does rise to world economic activity and world employment, then the whole course of international economic policy should be turned round with the one prime object of restimulating that activity and that employment. Nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of this.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the London Economist be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DANGEROUS WATERS

The international economic conjuncture is more worrying now than at any time since the end of the war. There is a definite danger of relapse into world illiberalism. It is conceivable that there could be a relapse into world recession. And too many of the governments and central financial authorities of the world are looking fixedly in the opposite direction.

To begin with the most familiar danger, that of old-fashioned, cyclical recession. It would be silly to exaggerate the warning signals, but even more silly completely to disregard them. In both the United States and Britain, the guardians of the two key world currencies, economic forecasters are singing a remarkably similar tune: they see the danger of some internal overheating of their economies in the first half of the year between now and April of 1966, but suspect that there may be a slowdown or possibly a downturn of activity in the second half of it. In Britain such a downturn seems only too probable. In the United States, it fortunately seems less so. Those who fear a recession there rest heavily on the apprehension that once American industry feels that it can cease stockpiling steel for fear of a strike in the early summer, it may stop buying too much and order too little. Most of the other so-called leading indicators in the much-charted American economy give an impression of strength, though not of unmixed strength. In Wall Street, most of the big institutional investors are said to be confident that no long setback is likely; this is important, because if there were a 1-day attack of stock market jitters, as in 1962, there would probably be a sufficient rush of bargain price orders to bring prices rebounding up again on the morrow. Still, when all this has been said, no practiced forecaster would deny that after the summer of this year the American economic prospect presents a picture of some uncertainty.

In continental Europe, France shows signs already of relapsing into a recession; the impact of this on total world demand might offset the fact that Italy should be about to recover from one. The other West European countries and Japan mostly expect further advances in 1965, though not at the great pace of some recent years (indeed in Japan this week stock market prices have touched a 4-year low, amid a rather worrying wavelet of bankruptcies, and none of the other major bourses has recently been looking exactly happy). Most important of all, over the rest of the world, and particularly over the primary producing countries, hang the clouds of a darkening prospect for international trade. These clouds arise because, even if the United States and Britain do escape an internal recession, both these key currency countries are most definitely going to be fighting throughout 1965 against what they regard as the grave balance-of-payments crises—and both at the same time.

So far, President Johnson's administration has tackled its balance-of-payments problem in what might be called a Socialist way: by direct cajolements and semicontrols against American capital transfers and tourist expenditure abroad. The Labor government of Britain began by tackling its problem in a high Tory way, through large temporary increases in import tariffs; since that has proved unpopular abroad, it is under pressure to resort now to the low Tory way of deflating the economy by a fairly tough budget. If these American and British measures work smoothly, in their declared object of seeing that the two reserve currency countries do not create any more reserves, their flow of funds to the outside world will be sharply curtailed. It is difficult to see how this can avoid giving a further deflationary twist to raw material prices.

The biggest danger of all will arise if these measures succeed in sharply cutting American and British outpayments to oversea countries, but do not appear to their respective governments to be succeeding sufficiently well, because of a concurrent growth of speculation against their currencies. The speculation against the dollar would be speculation in favor of gold. Already, the action of some European countries in converting their dollars into gold carries a threat of a snowball effect; however determinedly the Federal Reserve authorities deny that they would ever countenance a rise in the price of gold, everybody knows that a fall in the price of gold is even less likely, so that speculators have a one-way option. The speculation against sterling arises because every international businessman knows that if the dollar were devalued against gold, sterling would be devalued against it too, and certainly not by a lesser amount. From this, and from the battered weakness of sterling's reserves, despite the good February trade returns, yet another danger arises.

The tone of recent speeches by the Governor of the Bank of England and others suggests that the city would not disagree that 1965 does indeed carry at least some threat of being another 1931. But while to the ordinary man the horror of another 1931 means the specter of quite unnecessary unemployment and a total sizing up of international trade, to many conservative finance ministers and central bankers the nasty image of 1931 is that then was the year when there was a collapse of confidence in their established (and inefficient) way of running the international financial system. They instinctively suppose that it was this collapse of confidence which caused the slump and the unemployment—instead of the other way around. They believe that it is this faltering of confidence in a sound international financial system which must be fought at all costs, and they automatically associate lack of soundness with spending too much (especially on foreign goods), not with starting to spend too little. If there is a further series of large speculative movements of funds in the gold and foreign exchange markets this year, those in the eye of the storm will be liable to recommend two policies: A new dose of illiberal restrictions abroad, even though beggar-my-neighbor policies are the precise policies that need to be avoided; and further deflation at home, even though the whole free world's economic conjuncture might by then be set on a dangerously deflationary course. Then the snowball really could start to roll.

This is not a forecast of inevitable disaster. The odds, to repeat, are still that the world will avoid a serious international financial crisis this year, not because of brilliant international economic management, but just because of the luck of the way the wind blows. It can even be argued that none of the restrictive things that have been done in the past few months—except those done by

General de Gaulle—has in itself been demonstrably wrong. But it is certain that the world's chancelleries should at least be working out a contingency plan, in case the wind does blow the wrong way. The essence of it should be a determination that, if a serious threat does arise to world economic activity and world employment, then the whole course of international economic policy should be turned round with the one prime object of restimulating that activity and that employment. Nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of this: not the interesting differences of opinion between practicing economists on whether this or that scheme for increasing world liquidity is marginally preferable, not the attachment of central bankers to their accustomed system of rigidly fixed exchange rates, not the arguments that can no doubt be started about who has been most at fault.

The objections so far successfully voiced against all proposals for easing the rigidity of the present international payments mechanism and for increasing world liquidity—whether Triffin, Stamp, Maulding, Brookings proposals, or whatever—have been that they could make it too easy for wicked governments to inflate: because they could loosen the disciplinary restraints imposed by balance-of-payments difficulties under the present international mechanism. Even those who regard these restraints as still most necessary in existing circumstances must surely see that a contingency could arise when national reflations would be the path of virtue, and when it would be desirable to have an international payments mechanism that encouraged them. For the economic, and still more the political, consequences of any relapse into serious recession by the non-Communist world would be dire indeed.

At present there is no such contingency plan in existence. Since the murder of President Kennedy, there has been no commanding world leader with the modernity of economic mind to take over a dominating influence if a crisis does befall. It is one of the worrying accidents of 1965 that the political ministers directly in charge of economic and financial affairs in both America and Britain are going to be new, inexperienced men; in Europe, there is no economic or finance minister of outstandingly reassuring stature either. All the financial advisers are still instinctively attuned to fighting inflation instead of deflation. Most governments nowadays, unlike in the 1930's, do have a bevy of professional economic advisers, who understand the contingent problems; but most of them are quietist sorts of economists, anxious to avoid any impression of extremism by looking inconveniently far ahead, because in the last resort the politicians are not sufficiently engaged with economics to take kindly to far-out solutions when self-styled practical men say that such remedies are politically and institutionally impossible.

The most appropriate analogy is a seafaring one. The ship of the world economy is floating on what are still, to the immediate eye, relatively placid seas; but it is also now in latitudes which, by known experience, are a possible hurricane belt. There is no captain on the bridge. There are a number of mildly quarreling, inexperienced mates, of no agreed order of seniority. The financial advisers in the crew are well trained in the ways of sailing ships rather than steamships, and convinced that all that should be done is to make sure that one has a sound ship floating well above the Plimsoll line, rather than worrying oneself with abstract sciences like meteorology. There are a number of economic advisers about, who boast that, without being extremist or alarmist or avant garde, they have at least recommended that while passing through the hurricane belt we should consider carrying umbrellas. Although it is true that even in the most dangerous latitudes a hurricane hits even ill-organized ships only rarely, this is not a comfortable vessel to be on. We passengers, battened in the holds, have some reason to send up anguished wails about it.

MENOMINEE INDIAN TERMINATION BRINGS TRAGIC POVERTY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a few years ago Congress decided to terminate the reservation status of the Menominee Indians, the first time that an entire Indian tribe had gone through a termination of the position they enjoyed on a federally recognized reservation. I believe Congress would be interested in the consequences of that separation. I must report, regretfully, that the consequences for this Wisconsin tribe have been very bad, in spite of the fact that the State of Wisconsin and its university has tried to help the Menominees. The Menominees have suffered greatly. They are poor. Many are unemployed. The health of these Indians has suffered seriously.

This is the Nation which at one time controlled a large portion of Wisconsin, and with which we made a treaty under which one small primeval area in Wisconsin was to remain as their territory.

An article in the Milwaukee Sentinel of March 22 points out graphically how these fine Menominee people have suffered. And how this proud tribe is gradually and painfully disintegrating. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

POVERTY OF MENOMINEES AN ASSAULT ON SENSES

(By Larry Fields)

The poverty of the nearly 3,000 Menominee Indians struggling to survive in Wisconsin's Menominee County assaults the five senses.

Their poverty is the taste of despair and potatoes without meat.

It is the sound of a baby crying for food and an icy wind wheezing through a rotting hole in an occupied house.

It is the feel of castoff clothing and futility.

It is the odor of overcooked cabbage and unwashed bodies.

It is the sight of children with nothing to do and women who have turned too old too soon.

Above all, it is the chilling statistics which have just led the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs to call Menominee County a pocket of poverty.

And the pockets of nearly all who dwell there are empty.

President Johnson has declared that families existing on annual incomes of $3,000 a year or less are poverty stricken. The average annual wage in Menominee County is $2,300. The typical family consists of five persons.

Approximately one out of every seven persons in the county—412—receives welfare aid.

More than one-third of the Indian population—1,022—fuel their bodies on food surpluses distributed by the Federal Government.

With these grim figures, a daily fact of life, it is little wonder that many Menominees use whisky and sex as a temporary escape from reality.

There are, among the 496 families in the county, 113 problem drinkers, according to the Wisconsin State Medical Society. This includes a "distressing number of heavy drinking mothers."

The State department of public welfare reported in a 1962 survey that there were 4.8 unwed mothers in Wisconsin for every 10,000 people. The ratio of unwed mothers in Menominee County for the same population breakdown amounted to 99.8.

Although Menominee County is one of the most scenic sectors of Wisconsin, the picture there is a series of portraits in blue.

Ever since her husband died 2 years ago, Mrs. Agnes Moshoquit, 77, has been afraid that she might get sick or die without anyone knowing of it.

"I've got nobody now. Nobody ever comes to see me," she said.

Mrs. Moshoquit, tiny and toothless, lives in a rickety, two story frame house near the community of Neopit.

The rooms on the second floor are closed. Climbing stairs is difficult for an old woman: Besides, it is easier to heat only one floor in the house.

An ancient wood burning stove in the kitchen is the only source of warmth. The frail old woman must chop her own wood supply.

"I fell down four times last month when I went outside to chop," she said. "My leg and my hand still hurt."

There is, of course, no indoor plumbing. Until 2 weeks ago, she was able to draw water for cooking and washing from a well on her property.

But the pump broke and she can't afford to have it repaired.

Mrs. Moshoquit said that her nearest neighbors refuse to allow her to use their well unless she pays $1 per bucket of water. Her monthly income is $58 from social security benefits.

She requires only one bucket of water a day. But the nearest neighbor who will let her have the water free of charge lives one-quarter of a mile away.

This can be an agonizing journey in the winter.

Several times last month, Mrs. Moshoquit said, it was so cold inside her house that water she had stored overnight froze into ice by morning.

She doesn't own an automobile, and this adds to her hardship. There is no public transportation in Menominee County.

The closest store is 2 miles from her house. Unless she is willing to pay someone to drive her, she must hike to the store.

Several times a month, Father Marcellus Cabo, pastor of St. Anthony's Catholic Church in Neopit, stops by and serves as chauffeur.

The priest transports her to Keshena, 12 miles distant, to pick up her skimpy allotment of commodities from the food surplus depot.

"The hardest thing, though, is chopping the wood," she said. "After I chop the wood, I'm no good for the rest of the day."

The $56 a week that Edward Kauquatosh, 41, earns as a laborer in the Menominee lumber mill doesn't stretch very far. It has to support his wife, Mary, 45, and their 10 children, ages 8 and 18.

"Last week," he said, "I had to spend my whole paycheck on shoes for the kids."

Edward doesn't smoke or drink. He can't afford such pleasures.

The family's diet mainly revolves around their food surplus allotments. Fresh meat on the table is rare.

The Kauquatoshes usually have to pay a neighbor $5 to drive them to Keshena to pick up their monthly food rations.

Their home is 2 miles from the lumber mill. To save money, Edward eats lunch at home. This means he has to walk to and from work four times a day.

The medium-size framhouse in which Laura Wayka and Harriet Waukau live is

bursting with humanity. It is home to 22 people.

The girls, sisters, each with three childen, are supported by welfare aid.

The house, owned by their parents, is occupied by their grandfather, brothers and sisters, and acres of assorted children.

The youngest member of the clan is Laura's 1-month-old baby. The oldest is their 75-year-old grandfather.

The sour fragrance of cabbage and unwashed diapers permeates the house.

Laura, 23, was abandoned by her husband. She has no idea where he is.

Harriet, 24, divorced her husband.

The women tried living by themselves for awhile, but soon learned that their anemic welfare checks made such an arrangement practically impossible. xxxx

Because the family owns no car, they rarely go out. There are no movie theaters or any type of commercial entertainment in Menominee County. (There aren't even any doctors in the county.)

Entertainment consists of watching, in staggered shifts, the one television set.

William La Rock, Jr., 30, and his wife, Mary, 32, live with their three small children (ages 3, 2, and 1) in a shabby two-room shack which contains running insects instead of running water.

Each day La Rock drives to a small stream 3 miles from his house to fill a bucket with water. Often there are others at the stream with similar purposes.

La Rock was laid off from his job at the lumbermill last year and has been on welfare since. He occasionally works part time with the highway department.

The La Rocks said they were planning to leave Menominee this fall and move to Milwaukee.

"This is my home and I'll always love it, but there's nothing here for me anymore," he said. "At least I'll be able to find work in Milwaukee."

La Rock said that in the last year, 15 of his relatives moved to other cities in the Midwest.

More and more, the young Indians of Menominee County are leaving the land of their ancestors in order to survive.

BELOIT DAILY NEWS PRAISES SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Beloit Daily News, which is an outstanding Wisconsin newspaper, has commented on the sense of responsibility of the Nation's students. In view of all the criticism that has been leveled at the students of the Nation, this kind of thoughtful and objective praise by a highly respected newspaper should be called to the Nation's attention. It reads:

GOOD WORD FOR STUDENTS

Much is being said and written about young people going to the dogs in a handbasket, especially on college campuses. Perhaps college presidents are in the best position to know how college students are behaving, and one of them thinks he detects "an increasing maturity in the Nation's students." He is Vernon R. Alden, president of Ohio University at Athens.

"Today's students," he says, "regard college not as a haven from responsibility but as a training ground for citizenship. They see themselves as the conscience of the Nation; they are supplying the energy for needed social change."

One thing is certain, stresses Alden: More students are going into teaching, social work and politics, fewer into business. The reason is that they can live comfortably in almost any career they choose. Satisfaction, then, not money, becomes the deciding factor.

"As I look at today's students," says Alden, "I am deeply moved by their maturity. It is fortunate that they are accepting responsibility at such an early age, for already the torch of leadership is being passed to them."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM—THOUGHTFUL COMMENTS BY STUDENTS OF THE HISTORY CLASS OF CUSTER COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL IN MILES CITY, MONT., AND REPLY BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the members of Mr. Gray's junior year American history class in Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont., have written me recently to present their views on the situation in Vietnam and to ask me to state mine. These young men and women and their teacher, Mr. Gray, are to be commended for encouraging serious discussion and analysis of this issue. Their thoughtful comments in these letters give reassuring evidence that as the years go by Montana and the United States will continue to be blessed with an informed and responsible citizenry.

My reply to their request may be of some interest to others, and I therefore read it, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1965.

DEAR ———: I have received your letter and a number of other letters from your classmates concerning Vietnam. You express your views and you ask me to express mine on this very serious question.

First, I want to commend your teacher, Mr. Gray, for encouraging this discussion and I want to compliment you for participating in it in a most intelligent and mature way. I have gained a great deal in understanding from reading your letters.

Now let me state my views to you on Vietnam, as you requested.

The war in Vietnam is a war among Vietnamese but Americans are becoming more and more involved in the fighting. Scarcely a week goes by without a report of several American soldiers being killed or wounded. Each life is precious and each death a tragedy. But if we look at this situation fully, we will see that we are still not involved in the kind of conflict which we experienced in World War II or even in Korea. The casualties among Americans in those other conflicts would sometimes equal or surpass in 1 day what we have borne in Vietnam over the past several years.

In other words, the American involvement in the conflict in Vietnam is still far short of what it was in those other recent wars with which you are familiar, I am sure, from your class studies or the experiences of your own families.

Yet, the fighting in Vietnam could grow into another Korea or another world war. Some people say: "Well, why not? Let's go in and get it over with quickly." The answer is that that is not an answer at all. A war in Asia could last for many years, spread further and further and bring millions of casualties and cause widespread devastation and destruction. In my view, we owe it, not only to the rest of the world, but to our own people to do whatever can honorably be done to prevent that kind of tragedy and suffering.

But it is going to take two sides to prevent a larger war from developing out of Vietnam. And it is going to take two sides to bring to an end even the small war which is now in progress in Vietnam. If it is going to be an honorable end, it means that the people who live in South Vietnam have got to have reasonable security and a reasonable opportunity to decide what they want for themselves.

That is the reason why Americans were sent into Vietnam in the first place—to help the Vietnamese people. It is their country and it is still their war and I hope that it can be kept that way. I would not like to see the United States involved in Vietnam any longer than it takes to help bring about a just solution which secures the freedom of South Vietnam. I would want to see the fighting, not extended, but ended just as soon as possible on that basis.

That is the way the situation looks to me. Once again, I would like to compliment you and your classmates and your teacher for pursuing this discussion and to thank you for bringing me into it by your letters.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the Custer County High School students who wrote letters to me on the situation in South Vietnam.

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

Jim Beardsley, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Linda Bergerson, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Jerianne Chezum, Box 119, Miles City, Mont.

Virginia Clendenen, 809 South Sewell, Miles City, Mont.

Susan Enghusen, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Bill Hildenbrand, 216 North Eighth, Miles City, Mont.

Laura Jan Huntzicker, 412 South Center, Miles City, Mont.

Robert J. Kelley, 908 Woodbury, Miles City, Mont.

Rick Kouba, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Pat Mackenzie, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Barbie Petersohn, 1910 North Jordan, Miles City, Mont.

Lynn Ronning, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Carol Shook, 713 South Cottage Grove Ave., Miles City, Mont.

Linda Sterling, Route 1, Box 274, Miles City, Mont.

Anita Strub, 811 Wells, Miles City, Mont.

Jack Whitten, 2115 Main, Miles City, Mont.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO ON THE COLORADO SALINITY PROBLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the friendly and sympathetic atmosphere which exists between the Republic of Mexico and the United States has helped to make it possible to work out a solution to another long-standing irritant in our relations. It has just been announced that an agreement between the two nations covering the Colorado salinity problem has been achieved. It follows a 1963 treaty on the El Chamizal and ranks with it as an outstanding example of a solution to a complex and long-standing

international difficulty worked out by the processes of reason in a setting of mutual accommodation and mutual respect.

The water salinity problem on the Colorado River has caused considerable economic hardship to Mexican farmers who live near the border areas in the Mexicali Valley and who depend on the waters of the Colorado to irrigate their fields. And, of course, the utilization of the river is of immense importance in the agriculture and other activities of the Southwest region of our own Nation.

The new agreement is an equitable answer to the difficulty. It is expected to make sufficient fresh water available to both Mexicans and Americans living in the area served by the Colorado River.

Many months of hard work by Mexican and United States negotiators have gone into completing this settlement. The Governors of seven American States were consulted at every step of the negotiations and each gave their cooperation in making a solution possible. Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann, U.S. Ambassador Anthony Freeman, U.S. Border Commissioner Joseph Freidkin and his staff, Terrance G. Leonhardy and T. R. Martin of the Department of State, and Robert Sayre of the White House staff, represented the United States in the protracted negotiations. The main burden of the Mexican point of view was carried by former Ambassador Antonio Carrillo Flores, now Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Commissioner David Herrera Jordan. All of these men labored long and hard in working out a compromise. They have made a great contribution in the spirit of good neighborliness embodied in the Charter of Punta del Este. The Mexican-United States parliamentary meetings of the past several years have also made a profound contribution to this achievement not only by increasing the mutual understanding of the problem of Colorado salinity through discussions among the legislators of both countries but also by developing a high degree of reciprocal sympathy with respect to the whole range of relations between Mexico and the United States. The work of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who has headed the Senate group of the U.S. delegation, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the ranking Republican in the U.S. Senate, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Chairman of the Latin American Affairs subcommittee, and all the others on the delegation has been outstanding in this connection.

Still other problems exist between Mexico and the United States but the augury for their friendly and mutually beneficial settlement is encouraging. Needless to say if a similar spirit of reasonable amicability characterized our relations all over the world, the goal of world peace would be furthered immeasurably.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "United States, Mexico Reach Pact on River Water," published in the New York Herald Tribune on March 23, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SALT IN THE COLORADO: UNITED STATES, MEXICO REACH PACT ON RIVER WATER

(By Barnard L. Collier, Latin-American correspondent)

WASHINGTON.—The United States and Mexico reached final agreement yesterday on the touchy problem posed by the claim that the United States was pouring crop-killing salt water into Mexico's part of the Colorado River.

In a White House statement yesterday, President Johnson announced that he had approved an agreement worked out by the International Boundary and Water Commission. It will allow Mexico to control the salinity of the water flowing into irrigation ditches in the Mexicali Valley.

The agreement provides for a U.S.-built extension of an existing drainage canal which will divert salt-laden water from a U.S. irrigation project east of Yuma, Ariz., away from the Mexican irrigation system when the Mexicans choose to do so.

"The agreement has been considered by the Governors of the Colorado River Basin States and by the chairmen of the appropriate congressional committees," said the President, "and all have agreed to it."

The diversion project is expected to cost the United States about $5 million. If Congress speeds additional appropriations, the project will be finished by next October—the period when the Colorado flows least and saltiest into Mexico.

Among the nearly 300,000 Mexicans in the rich Mexicali Valley just below the California border, the angry cry of "sal"—salt—has long signified anti-Yankeeism. In the last 5 years, Leftists and Communists rallied peasants and farmers to protest and riot.

The dispute dates to shortly after the 1944 treaty between the United States and Mexico, which guarantees Mexico at least 1.5 million acre feet of the Colorado River's water each year. (An acre-foot is the amount of water needed to cover 1 acre of land to the depth of 1 foot.)

That quantity, the negotiators knew, was sufficient for future irrigation purposes in the cotton-growing valley. But even then they realized the quality of the water would some day become a sticky issue.

The Colorado River water that flowed across the border into Mexico then contained approximately 900 parts of salt per million parts of water—a little more than is tasty, but usable nonetheless. Then more and more irrigation projects using the Colorado's water were started on the U.S. side.

The project that caused most of the trouble was the Wellton-Mohawk farm development near Yuma. There the irrigation waters from the Colorado turned desert into lush farmland. But the relatively pure water that made crops grow in Yuma area was drained back into the Colorado via the Gila River and crossed the border into Mexico laden with leached out salt.

On occasion, the Mexicans insisted, the water flowing back out of the Yuma area contained up to 20,000 parts of salt per million parts of water. (Sea water contains about 35,000 parts per million.) The Mexicans were furious.

The salt crisis finally brought a joint United States-Mexican communique in the early summer of 1962, in which President Kennedy and Mexico's President Adolfo Lopez Mateos promised to reach a permanent solution by October 1963.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation opened 12 fresh-water wells that pumped clear water into the Gila and diluted the Yuma waste water down to 4,000 parts of salt per million. By the time it mixed with the Colorado water again the salt level dropped to about 1,800 parts per million.

Still Mexico claimed that the wells alone were no permanent solution.

The Bureau of Reclamation, however, contended that the water going to Mexico was usable. If the Mexicans would lay tiles along their irrigation ditches, keeping much of the water from draining through salty soil and getting even saltier, the farms at the end of their irrigation network would have little to complain about, the Bureau said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on what has been said by the distinguished majority leader. One of the plus signs that we can put against our foreign relations these days—and we have had too few of them—is the relationship which now exists between the United States and the Republic of Mexico. At no time in history has the relationship between these two countries been more amicable and more understanding than it is today. That is because the officials of our executive branch of the Government and the representatives of our legislative branch of Government and their counterpart of the Mexican Government have been considerate and understanding in dealing with the problems which have confronted us.

Of all the work which has been done, no one has made a greater contribution to the complete understanding which we have on so many subjects with our neighbors to the south today than has the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He is greatly admired and respected, not only by Mexican officials, but by all the people of Mexico as well. I am glad to pay him this well earned tribute at this time.

TRANSFERRING THE COSTS OF FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Johnson administration has proposed to transfer the costs of Federal meat inspections to the meat industry. In his recent budget message the President asserted:

> Fairness to all taxpayers demands that those who enjoy special benefits should bear a greater share of the costs.

He then singled out the costs of Federal meat inspection as an example of an activity in which he would shortly propose legislation for that purpose.

In my opinion, the President could have hardly picked a worse example as a vehicle for charging "those who enjoy special benefits" with the costs of Federal services. It is fallacious and spurious to assume that the meat industry is the sole or even the major beneficiary of meat inspection.

Federal meat inspection has the sole purpose of insuring that every American who eats meat—and I daresay that includes virtually our entire population—buys only wholesome, disease-free meat

products when he shops at his meat market or grocery store. If anything, Federal meat inspection imposes financial burdens on the meatpackers and others who fall under the scope of the Federal activity. They must maintain high standards of cleanliness in their operations that are costly. Yet those costs are willingly absorbed to insure that the consumer receives the highest quality meat and meat products.

It is the consumer who receives the benefit of the Federal meat inspection, not the industry.

The President's proposal would without question weaken inspection and endanger health. It is difficult to believe that President Johnson would advocate such a result.

By using the President's strange line of reasoning there are many other Federal activities which special user charges could be placed on the direct beneficiaries. For example, why are not the salaries of FBI agents charged to the users or beneficiaries of their services? Why are not the costs of mine safety inspections absorbed by the coal industry? Why are not the costs of the multifarious activities of the U.S. Public Health Service charged to users such as a community which has had its water supply inspected or those members of a community who have been saved from a possible outbreak of a communicable disease by quick action from a Public Health Service team of medical sleuths who have traced the course of a carrier of a deadly disease? Or why not charge the costs of Federal Aviation Agency inspections of airports and aircraft to the industry? Or why not charge customs inspections to those who are having their baggage checked? Or why should not the entire cost of the National Bureau of Standards be borne by industry or other direct recipients of its services? Or why not charge the food and drug industries with the costs of FDA inspections?

It would be possible to go on and develop an imposing list of services performed by the Federal Government that might be charged to a so-called specific user, but I cite the examples listed above merely to emphasize my point. The costs of Federal meat inspection, the FBI, the Public Health Service, the FAA, the FDA, and the National Bureau of Standards and many, many others are not intended to help specific individuals. They are for the protection of all of us. They are for the promotion of the public health, safety, and welfare—to mention the specific constitutional authority under which these programs were established. Therefore, the costs of these programs should be borne by the general public in the form of tax revenues.

There is no practical way in which industry can fairly absorb the costs. The costs can go only in two places if placed on the industry. They can be transferred to the consumer in the form of higher meat prices, which is highly unlikely because of the competitive situation with both meat imports and nonfederally inspected meats. Or, the costs can be transferred to the meat animal producers by paying them less for their product. This would be a gross injustice. The beef cattle industry is already hard-pressed financially by competition from beef imports, increasing production costs, and low market prices.

There are many meatpacking plants in the United States. Of course, the most of them by far are small operations. The President's proposal would be disastrous to small packers and processors and would result in a curtailment of the market for livestock in the areas where they are located.

Mr. President, the Washington Post on March 22, carried an excellent editorial opposing the proposed transfer of Federal meat inspection costs. I ask unanimous consent that it 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 Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 22, 1965]

PAYING INSPECTION COSTS

A quiet move is underway in Washington and in some of the States to shift the cost of meat inspection from the taxpayer to the packers. The idea has a superficial appeal because of the budgetary savings it would permit, but it is also arousing much opposition. Many observers believe that it would bring about a deterioration in the service and accentuate fluctuations in the price of meat.

In a strong market, it is assumed that meat inspection costs assessed against the packers would be passed on to the consumers, causing prices to rise more than they otherwise would. In a weak market, packers would deduct the cost of inspection from prices paid to livestock producers, thus adding to the troubles of an industry which has been under pressure in recent years. Congress will doubtless be wary of approving a possible depressant to livestock prices.

More serious is the underlying principle of paying for public services out of the public purse. Meat inspection is required for the protection of people against disease. It is said that 30 diseases which afflict human beings may be derived from animals. Rigid and independent inspection of all meat put on the market is imperative to protect the public from these sources of infection. This work is as much a public function as the quarantining of individuals with communicable diseases.

If the cost of meat inspection were charged against the packers, inspectors would almost inevitably feel some obligation to those who paid their salaries. Businessmen are not asked to pay the policeman who patrols the street. Importers are not asked to pay the customs official who checks over their purchases abroad. It is the public in general that benefits from impartial and thorough inspection of meat, and we think the public should continue to pay for it from the public purse.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont would yield, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I shall retain my right to the floor.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STATUS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the current crisis in Vietnam is not escalated into total war, a course to which I am utterly opposed, some kind of negotiations must ultimately take place—when or where, I do not know.

Of one thing I am reasonably sure, however; it is that the basic negotiation will be between parties who do not trust each other.

In the present state of affairs, the North Vietnamese and their allies will not trust the South Vietnamese and their allies, and vice versa.

If military forces are to be withdrawn, if liquidation in blood is to be avoided, there must be some international presence to police the terms of whatever agreement may be reached.

I do not seek to prejudge the nature of negotiations or to propose methods of policing arrangements, except to note that devices similar to the International Control Commission have been spectacularly unsuccessful in both Vietnam and Laos.

Perhaps they would work if reconstituted, or if they were operating under more viable agreements than the 1954 accords on Vietnam and the 1962 agreement on Laos.

I could not agree more with those who say that the Vietnamese conflict cries out for United Nations attention.

But in the present situation, it is an idle dream to suppose that this bankrupt organization could be effective.

The sad thing, perhaps even the tragedy of the 1960's, is that the United Nations when it is needed most is virtually non compos mentis.

It is unable to act in ways in which it might be effective.

As reported in a recent article in a news magazine:

It all started with the U.N. bond issue, initiated in 1962 by the United States to provide for collective financing of the Congo operation in the face of increasing congressional hostility both to the operation and to the fact that the United States had been paying voluntarily 60 percent or more of the costs.

There were among us in Congress some who saw in the bond issue the beginning of the undermining of the financial integrity of the United Nations—a process which has now proceeded to the point where that Organization cannot be called upon when it is most needed.

Financial manipulations, encouraged by the United States in 1960 and 1961, made it possible for states who were falling behind in payment of their assessments for peacekeeping operations to use the device of a large U.S. grant to keep their records clear.

They were not only permitted to do this, they were even encouraged to do it, although as a matter of principle many of these states themselves supported the

opposition of the Soviet Union to the exercise by the General Assembly of authority to fix assessments for peacekeeping operations.

Senators will recall that during debate on the United Nations bond issue some of us questioned the administration rather vigorously on two points:

First, we sought to learn from the Department of State what the American reaction would be if the General Assembly were at some future time to assess the United States for the costs of sending a United Nations force into some area where the United States had its vital interests involved on the other side.

Specifically, I asked one nongovernment witness:

> If the International Court finds the operations in the Congo perfectly legal, and the assessments to pay the costs thereof binding upon its members, would it be possible for the United Nations to send troops of different nations into any country in the Western Hemisphere and assess the United States for its share of the costs regardless of the fact that we might have vetoed such action in the Security Council?

This was a question the State Department did not want to consider, let alone answer.

The Department was so concerned with rubbing the Russian and French noses into the legal interpretation of article 19; it was so sure that the General Assembly would follow American legal reasoning; it was so sure that the General Assembly would never find the United States on the minority side, that the Department was not able to even contemplate the discomfort of having the shoe on the other foot.

Even in 1962, some Members of this body felt that the State Department, in the words of a recent editorial, published in the New Republic of February 13, 1965, was "trying to enforce on Russia and France a principle which it would never allow to be enforced against the United States."

Some of us saw then what the New Republic now describes "in retrospect," namely, that—

> The State Department's thesis looks more like a clever ploy than a noble policy, for nobody seriously contends that the Department, much less Congress, would accept as binding on America an assessment of the General Assembly for a peacekeeping venture, or any other kind of venture, authority for which was adopted over U.S. objection.

The second point some of us pursued with the administration was that the U.N. bond issue was an unfortunate device to put off the evil day when, with or without Court approval, the national interests of a great power would serve to nullify article 19.

That day is now here. We urged in 1962 that the issue be faced then, and that we not procrastinate.

Some Members of this body proposed a short-term loan to the United Nations, not in an effort to put off the evil day, but to bring the issue of financing the U.N. to a head so that it could be dealt with in time to avoid the hamstringing of the United Nations at some critical moment when it was needed.

Others urged that alternative methods of financing these peacekeeping operations be explored, including a proposal I made that the World Bank devote some of its special reserve funds—now at over $1 billion—to helping the United Nations solve its financial difficulties.

I do not overstate the case if I say now that these positions were rather quietly sneered at.

There is an almost overpowering phobia in the executive branch of the Government toward ideas emanating from Congress.

But what is past is prolog. It is prolog to the situation in which we find ourselves now.

The American approach to the financing of the United Nations has collapsed like a punctured balloon. The balloon which so many conscientious and hard-working nongovernmental groups supported as late as 1962 has now gone flat.

No wonder that at the moment the United Nations is foundering. Very few people in or out of Government seem to be concerned.

In 1945, only two U.S. Senators voted against the United Nations Charter.

In fact, the devotion and the worth of a Senator at that time was likely to be judged by the ardor with which he supported the charter.

Yet, today less than 20 years later, no Member of Congress rises to his feet, with voice trembling with patriotic emotion, seeking to defend the U.N. or even demand its survival.

World statesmen only sporadically and unemotionally call for the preservation of the Organization.

And the press of the world, including our own great publications, fails to battle the creeping paralysis which is inexorably chilling and numbing the body of this world organization.

Our great editors seem content with dreary pedantic studies which offer no real solution to the critical need.

The enthusiasts who only a decade ago were valiantly essaying to strengthen the United Nations seem to have found other outlets for their crusading spirit.

The present situation is fraught with irony.

At no time since San Francisco have the United States and Russia been closer to a common understanding of the interests of the great powers in the United Nations.

These two nations know all too well the cataclysmic effect of a nuclear confrontation.

They know, also, of the desire of the smaller, poorer nations that outnumber them to share the world's wealth and fasten small power solutions on the great power interest—at the expense of the great powers, of course.

Actually, the current dispute over financing the police operations of the United Nations is a symptom rather than the cause of the deeper malignancy affecting the United Nations.

The real sickness involves the readjustment of powers and influence between the greater powers and the lesser nations rather than a struggle between the Soviet bloc and the West.

Indirectly, this struggle does affect our relationship with the Communist bloc, but this relationship will become more understanding and manageable once the great power and small power problems have been worked out.

To find a solution to this issue, we have to realize that it involves a new relationship between the Security Council, where the great powers are dominant, and the General Assembly, where the smaller powers have the votes.

A new workable method of financing United Nations peace and security functions would not result in merging great power and small power thinking into a single school of thought, but it certainly would enhance the prospect of the U.N. again becoming a virile organization and would give hope to the unsung and inarticulate millions that have been giving way to despair.

Out of the several financing proposals that have been put forth, a workable system can be developed, one which will instill vitality into a presently anemic but vitally necessary international body.

It is not my purpose at this time to review these suggestions.

With all the talent available to the executive branch of the Government, there should be no great difficulty in developing reliable means to pay for peace and security functions.

I have put forth my proposal for World Bank assistance on several occasions.

I have recently noted a most interesting proposal put forth in a private memorandum I have received, the substance of which is repeated in an editorial entitled "The U.N. Abused," published in the New Republic of February 13, 1965. While this proposal in itself does not provide a complete answer, it does nevertheless furnish a basis upon which a workable and acceptable structure might be founded.

Mr. President, one thing which bothers me very much is the evidence I have seen in the press indicating that the United States is still indulging in questionable practices in financing the United Nations.

Senators will recall that late last year the United States, with calculated care, made it clear to the United Nations that the United States would withhold its pledge to the United Nations Special Fund until there had been some settlement of the article 19 issue.

In short, we told the lesser developed nations of the United Nations that unless they stuck with the United States on the crucial issue of whether France and Russia would be denied a vote in the General Assembly until they had paid up their past assessments for peacekeeping, there would apparently be no massive U.S. contribution to the technical assistance activities of the United Nations.

I need not remind Senators that the U.N. did adjourn after a procedural vote—interpreted by some as a repudiation of the U.S. position—but it adjourned with its financial problem still unresolved.

But now what has happened?

On March 2, 1965, 3 weeks ago, the United States announced that it would donate $60 million to the United Nations Special Fund and expanded technical assistance program.

In the words of the New York Times:

Three months ago, when negotiations were underway to try to solve the knotty financial and political problems of the world organization, Washington delayed its usual pledge to the program to exert pressure on the Soviet Union, France, and other countries to pay assessments.

One might well ask why the United States decided all at once to contribute $60 million to the Special Fund.

The answer was quick in coming.

The next day a headline in the Washington Post read as follows: "U.N. May Need Loan; Cash Low."

The story points out that although members had been asked to pay the equivalent of 80 percent of their 1964 assessments, only a trickle of money has been coming in.

Then, significantly continues the dispatch:

If members have not paid up $6 million by the end of next week, the U.N. will have to borrow from the deposited reserves of the U.N. Special Fund. It will then have to pay the Special Fund interest equal to the return now being earned by the Fund's investments.

And where does the Special Fund get its money? The United States, of course.

The United States contributes 40 percent of the budget of the Special Fund and had announced a $60 million donation the day before.

Mr. President, I am no financial genius.

I have neither the time nor the inclination to audit the books of the United Nations. So what I am about to say will undoubtedly be denied, misunderstood, or quibbled away.

But on the face of the evidence I submit that the following propositions are a fair statement of the present situation:

First. The United Nations is seriously in debt because of the cost of so-called peacekeeping operations which have been voted by the General Assembly over the objections of certain permanent members of the Security Council.

Second. General Assembly assessments to meet the cost of peacekeeping operations have in general not been paid by members who have disagreed with the purpose for which the assessments were levied.

Third. The United States has insisted that assessments levied by the General Assembly for peacekeeping operations are a legitimate charge upon all members and that failure to pay these assessments should result in denial of voting rights to delinquent members.

Fourth. The United States in support of this position was willing to delay meeting the issue by supporting the sale of U.N. bonds to buy time for resolving the financial issue.

Fifth. When the chips were really down and the United States was confronted with the alternative of forcing an Assembly vote on the application of article 19 to Russia and France, with the possibility that a winning vote might have led to Russian withdrawal, it backed away. The United States now recognizes that if it were in the position of the Russians or the French, it would probably react in the same way.

Sixth. Having muddled through the recently adjourned session of the General Assembly without resolving the financial difficulties of the United Nations, the United States is now paying Peter so that Paul may be robbed—with interest, of course, and in accordance with a resolution of the General Assembly adopted during its recent session by the technique of unanimous consent.

Mr. President, there are those who may think that the burden of my remarks is negative.

I assure them that is not my intention.

I want the United Nations to survive.

I want it available as an instrument capable of action in trouble spots wherever they may arise.

I want United Nations bridges to be strong enough to bear all kinds of traffic between East and West, between the underdeveloped world and the developed world, and between the Soviet bloc and the free world.

This is not presently the case.

If the United Nations is ever to have a future, it must stop avoiding issues on the theory that if they are avoided they will go away.

Its future is contingent also upon candor in recognition of long-term interests as well as short-term expediencies.

There is no point in reviewing the failures or the successes of the past.

We must start from where we are.

On the part of the United States, this means acceptance of the fact that it is unwilling and unable to force the United Nations to abide by article 19.

It means acceptance of the fact that the United States is not willing to have article 19 applied to itself when its vital interests are involved.

It means that the United States must admit frankly that once again it is meeting U.N. expenses indirectly by supporting activities such as that of the United Nations Special Fund, from which funds in turn are borrowed to meet other expenses of the United Nations.

In short, Mr. President, this Nation needs a clean and forthright statement of what the United Nations means to the United States in 1965, as distinct from repetitions of what it meant in 1945.

Only by this clearing of the decks will it be possible for the United Nations to proceed in a constructive way to get its financial affairs in order so that, in terms of the bureaucracy, it may once again become a viable institution for peace.

Let there be no mistake. The United Nations with its many shortcomings still serves the interests of the great powers, even though they be on the opposite sides of many crucial issues.

It also serves the interests of the small powers, perhaps even more since their voices and influence would be lost if the United Nations were to lapse into obscurity.

Finally I want to say this:

The time has come for the President of the United States to cut through the underbrush of procrastination and mutable principles that have enveloped the United Nations.

He can do this by putting the strength of his office and his personality behind any one of a number of proposals for solving the financial problems of the United Nations.

He could instruct his representative to the United Nations to reconcile our position with the Soviet and French position on the assessment of members for peacekeeping functions—a view which may shock some, but a position which would definitely be in our own national interest.

What if article 19 does become a dead letter if, as a result, the United Nations continues available as an instrument of peace?

Unless some agreement is reached by the great powers, article 19 is dead as a doornail anyway.

International events of recent weeks seem to have overwhelmed the capacity of this Government for affirmative action, except in the military field.

The President of the United States has a magnificent opportunity to put the United States back into the lead in international diplomacy by putting the United Nations back into business.

It is his personality, rather than the accumulated prejudices of the State Department that must present our image.

It is harder to be magnanimous than petty; it is harder to be realistic, than legalistic. But we must be.

I am not yet ready to abandon the United Nations.

I do not think the American people are ready to abandon it.

I do not think the people of this world are ready to abandon it.

And I do not think the President of the United States is ready to abandon it, either.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Once again the distinguished Senator from Vermont has performed a public service. He is not known as a waster of words, but he is known for his commonsense, and his down-to-earth attitude, on which basis he so ably reflects not only his own State of Vermont, but the United States of America as well.

First of all, let me compliment the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the dean of Republicans in this body, for the remarks which he has just made.

I recall that when the U.N. bond issue was before this body some years ago, he was roundly criticized, and without the slightest justification, not by his colleagues, to be sure, but by some columnist and others, for stating some plain truths about the financial situation of the U.N. and for forecasting a recrudescence of the problem if the truth were not faced. His colleagues on both sides of the aisle were as one in his defense; not that he needed it, because every one of us knows that when the able and distinguished Senator expresses himself he does so with the greatest of sincerity and with the plain wisdom and straightforwardness and integrity associated with the State of Vermont.

It is most unfortunate that his words on that earlier occasion were not heard with the same understanding in the executive branch and heeded by that branch as they were on the floor of the

Senate. We would not now be up against the predicament of a U.N. with seriously eroding influence to our detriment and that of the world that now confronts us.

It may not be too late to check this trend; and if it is at all possible, it will be due to the courage, honesty, and perception of men of the caliber of the Senator from Vermont, whose words, I hope, this time will not fall on deaf ears in the sectors of the executive branch which have day-to-day responsibility for formulating our policies and conducting our operations in the U.N.

So once again I compliment the Senator from Vermont on his statement on the U.N.

I would note further that he has also made a contribution to the discussion of the Vietnamese problem by relating the difficulty of its solution to the financial difficulties of the United Nations.

If the Senator would permit me, I would like to draw from him additional elucidation on several points which he raised either directly or inferentially on this point.

Could the Senator suggest in what way the United Nations might be useful in resolving the Vietnamese conflict if it were not confronted with financial difficulties?

Mr. AIKEN. As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, either the situation in Vietnam and the military operations there will escalate into a greater war, with a strong possibility that it may become a total war through the use of nuclear weapons, or negotiations must take place at some point. I do not know where or when that will be.

As I pointed out, if negotiations take place and some agreement is reached between the north and south sections of Vietnam, such agreement will have to be watched over and its terms enforced. That is obvious. It is obvious from the experience we have had in Laos and Vietnam up to date, that that policing body or watching body cannot be set up by either or both of the conflicting parties if they do not trust each other. If we had a strong United Nations, it would be the logical body to carry out the supervision of any agreement reached by North and South Vietnam and their allies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I take it, then, that the Senator is of the opinion that in various circumstances and in various parts of the world, if there were a fairly, or fairly thoroughly, united U.N., with adequate financing it could be of continued service in maintaining the peace and trying to bring order out of discord.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is expressing my thoughts exactly. I feel if there were a strong, reliable, nonbankrupt United Nations at this time, there would be a greater willingness to negotiate between the warring parties, the warring philosophies in southeast Asia, than there is today. I feel that one reason they continue fighting today is that they do not know what the end would be if they started negotiating, provided there were no other body capable of supervising the carrying out of the terms of any agreement which might be reached.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has anticipated my next question by answering it, so I will forgo it; but I would like to ask this question if the Senator will yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator outline to the Senate his views of the extent and nature of the U.S. interests in Vietnam?

Consideration of this question involves, it seems to me, the evaluation of the domino or cork-in-the-bottle theory of southeast Asia affairs.

Is it likely, in the Senator's judgment, that a settlement in Vietnam would be followed certainly by all the other nations in southeast Asia going down the Chinese drain, so speak?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not completely sure what our interests in South Vietnam or that part of the area may be today, but I know what they were when we first went into South Vietnam. The Senator from Montana may recall that one night he and I had a rather protracted discussion with President Diem, whom I considered as the best administrator that country ever had.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no question about it; and his assassination was one of the most unfortunate events that could have occurred. It marked the decline of South Vietnam as a free and independent nation.

Mr. AIKEN. It hit the skids as soon as he was ousted from office and assassinated. We went in there at his request because there were a few hundred, or possibly a few thousand, rebels throughout the country.

We have stayed there. Four or five years ago, we had 400 advisers, largely of an economic nature, in there. I am in favor of that. I believe that we have placed too much emphasis on our military operations and too little on economic support for South Vietnam. The situation has gone from bad to worse. It became intolerable after President Diem was assassinated. At the present time we have approximately 30,000 troops in South Vietnam, with probably more on the way if the war should escalate and its area be expanded—which will probably mean as many as 300,000 to 400,000 additional troops to be sent there. I have heard of even larger estimates. A good share of our Navy is tied up in that area, which is not counted in the estimates we read as to the kind of assistance we are giving South Vietnam.

Yet, I do not believe that we can get out precipitately. The situation has become so bad, and so much bitterness has been engendered, that there would undoubtedly be thousands of executions in Saigon and other parts of the country should we get out before an understanding was reached.

Now the Senator from Montana had another part of his question which related to this subject.

Mr. MANSFIELD. About a settlement in Vietnam, I asked if it would be followed by all the rest of the nations of southeast Asia going down the Chinese drain?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe that it would be followed by that. I do not believe that the smaller countries of southeast Asia have any more desire to become satellites of China and come under the control of Red China than have the countries of Eastern Europe any desire to be satellites of Russia, from which they are now gradually emerging into their own again—I hope they are, anyway.

I believe that North Vietnam has every reason in the world not to wish to become a satellite of Red China; and that she will not become a satellite of Red China unless the United States forces her to become one. But, if we continue raids over North Vietnam and continue the use of the weapons which we have been using, apparently more or less indiscriminately, we may force North Vietnam to call on China for Chinese troops by the million.

As we have read in the morning newspapers, we know that China has asserted that if North Vietnam calls on her for men, she will supply them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct in his reading of the morning press. He is also correct in his earlier assumption, because it is based on the more than 1,000 years of enmity which has existed between the people of Vietnam and the Chinese colossus to the north.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Montana is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We know that all the countries in southeast Asia were, at one time, tributaries or vassal states of the Chinese Empire.

Now, if the Senator from Vermont will yield further——

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator knows, there has been a great deal written in the press of late concerning the use of so-called riot gas and napalm in Vietnam.

Is the Senator aware that the decision to use the so-called riot gas was made by the South Vietnamese, and that insofar as our Government is concerned, the decision to make it available was that of someone way down the bureaucratic line; and, further, insofar as the President was and is concerned, I can state flatly that he did not know of its use until after the fact, even though the gas was first used approximately 3 months ago.

What is the Senator's reaction to an officer of the bureaucracy who takes it upon himself to make a decision of this kind, or who fails to inform the politically responsible officer of the Government—and I mean the President—of a decision to use it on the part of our South Vietnamese allies?

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator has stated, I am sure that the President had no knowledge that these unusual and nearly—if not quite—outlawed weapons were to be used against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese people.

Mistakes have been made. The worst mistake is probably the gap in the line of command from the top down to the bottom. Somewhere along that line of command, someone took it upon himself to supply the weapons for which the President is now getting the blame. The rest of the world is not going to try to hunt up the officers who approved the use of napalm or gas of any kind—even

a non-lethal gas—the rest of the world will blame the President. The President, in their eyes, is the United States.

It is one of our most unfortunate happenings; but, I repeat, I am sure that the President had no knowledge that any gas was to be used until he heard about it through the news media.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I believe that the President was notified, for the first time, 2 or 3 days ago, by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara.

However, it is a situation which psychologically is bound to have adverse effects so far as this country is concerned. No one should underplay the importance of psychology in relation to our position with respect to the rest of the peoples of the world.

Will the Senator from Vermont yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Turning to the Senator's penetrating analysis of the United Nations financial difficulties, would not the Senator from Vermont agree that the larger question for all of the member nations of the United Nations—including ourselves—is to decide not in generalizations, but in specifics, just what it is they wish the United Nations to be, what role they wish it to play, and just how that role can be effectively realized and implemented?

Mr. AIKEN. There is no question as to what the nations of the world wish the United Nations to be.

All nations, including our own, are selfish to a degree and wish the United Nations to benefit them, but in the aggregate, the nations of the world wish the United Nations to be an organization which will encourage understanding throughout the world and not be an arena for carrying on squabbling or inciting developments which become worse than squabbles.

I believe that the nations of the world wish the United Nations to be a body which will promote the economic and social levels of all countries—including our own.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Including our own.

Mr. AIKEN. We can be selfish to that extent, just as much as Tanganyika, Bolivia, or any other country can. I believe that the nations of the world wish the United Nations to sponsor and promote agreements which promote peace among the nations of the world. I do not believe there is any question as to what the world wishes the United Nations to be. That is what it was set up for in 1945, but we have not kept up with the times.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is a question of realization and implementation, and perhaps revision of the charter, as provided for in San Francisco in 1945.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Montana is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Vermont yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that the United States was partly instrumental in bringing about the present difficulty, by creating in 1950, with the so-called uniting for peace resolution, the illusion that the General Assembly could be utilized as a substitute for an estopped Security Council? The idea might have looked good at the time, but now it has come back to haunt us in this financial dilemma. Does not the distinguished Senator from Vermont agree?

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Montana. But, at that time, the membership of the United Nations was so small that the United States was nearly always sure of a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly, and did not look forward to the time when it would be in the minority.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Vermont, of course, having served so well as a delegate to the United Nations, is well aware that what he speaks is the truth.

As the Senator pointed out several years ago, if we continue to step into the financial breach which results largely from a willingness of member nations to vote for actions but not to pay for them, we are only adding to the long-range problem of the United Nations, as the Senator from Vermont has indicated. We put off facing this problem in effect by the bond purchase a few years ago.

Does the Senator believe that it should be put off again or that it is wise to avoid facing the problem at this time?

Mr. AIKEN. It should not be put off. It should not have been put off 2 years ago, either. I became rather worked up over the proposal of the U.N. to go into deficit financing through the issuance of bonds, of which the United States was supposed to buy the lion's share, and then have the little nations of the world, about 80 of them, stop paying their dues when the proposal to go on deficit financing was made. The first proposal put before the body was to issue bonds in the amount of $200 million. It is my belief that that was to be the initial issue, with plans to go on deficit financing for a long time, and that some of them really had in mind the issuing of nearer to $2 billion worth of bonds than $200 million worth. The United States would have been expected to buy most of them. That would have been another indirect method of the United States paying the bills for everybody else. The 80 small countries stopped paying their dues when this proposal was made, because they thought that if the United Nations went into deficit financing, they would be able to vote for all kinds of programs and charge them to the issuance of the bonds, most of the money for which eventually would come from the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. Many of these nations will vote for huge appropriations, but when the time comes to have them pay their pro rata share, they will not do so.

Mr. AIKEN. One representative of a small nation, that had been assessed $8,000, I believe, said to me, "But we are poor. You are rich. You pay it."

Mr. MANSFIELD. We probably did. Will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does it not seem somewhat foolish for our State Department to have spent years trying to force the Soviets to pay for peacekeeping operations which it does not support and then withdrawing from the precipice when the Soviets persist in their refusal to pay? It seems rather futile to me to insist that article 19 be enforced and then to withdraw from that position at the last moment. Either we believe in the application of that article or we do not. And the executive branch ought not to talk one way before the Congress and another in the halls of the United Nations. We cannot have it both ways. Is it not incumbent upon us to decide which way we want it? Is the executive branch not, in essence, seeking to force on others the application of a principle which if forced on us at another time we would strenuously resist?

Mr. AIKEN. We certainly would not agree to pay the cost of maintaining a United Nations police force in Panama or Haiti or in any other part of the world where our interests were strong. Yet we insist on enforcing this on other countries who feel about it as we would under similar circumstances.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator. He has made a distinct contribution; and, as always, I have learned a great deal.

Mr. AIKEN. We certainly should not do as we did last fall and threaten the smaller countries that we would not give anything to the special fund until those countries help us force Russia to pay for something which the Russians did not believe in, and which we would not do ourselves if we were in their position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator read the press reports this morning, I believe.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I read those reports this morning. After we had made a positive statement last fall, we backed away from it, with the result that less than a month or 3 weeks ago we made a contribution of $60 million to the special fund. That could have been made at that time for no other purpose than to enable the U.N. itself to borrow from that fund to keep going until we could think of some other method of handling it. Our part in the U.N. has not been particularly laudable in recent years, certainly not in recent months.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, first, I should like to join the majority leader in saying that the able Senator from Vermont has made a very important contribution to this very difficult subject. I listened to a great part of his speech and read all of it. There is one point that I should like to bring out. As a member of the Appropriations Committee and as one who has supported foreign aid and who has supported the United Nations since its creation, I regret to say that it seems to me that the United Nations increasingly is becoming another entity—if we want to call it that—of the United States.

If the United Nations were to be entirely or even to a large extent, financed by the U.S. Government, I would question the value of the United Nations. In such a case it would probably be better for us to proceed independently, rather than through the

United Nations. I should not like to see that happen.

The Senator is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. As a member of that committee I have devoted much time and attention in recent years to the matter of appropriations for foreign aid and international organizations.

Our problem, with respect to the United Nations, is complicated by the fact that its budget is made up in November and voted on in December. Then the executive department comes along and asks us to appropriate money in June in the amount that has been agreed upon.

The Senator mentioned $60 million. So far as I know, we have had no request for it, certainly not in the Appropriations Committee. It seems to me that it is very important, if the United Nations is to continue—and, like the Senator from Vermont, I hope it will continue—that Congress, as the appropriating body, shall be given the opportunity to discuss what our payments should be and the background on which our payments are to be based.

Is it the opinion of the Senator from Vermont who has expressed his views on this subject so well that the executive department should give Congress a greater opportunity to discuss our relationship to the United Nations including its financial aspects?

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, Congress has every right in the world to discuss this situation, because Congress is elected by the people of the United States, and it represents the people of the United States. We cannot be expected merely to rubberstamp any ideas which may happen to emanate from the executive branch. As an example, I read from an Associated Press dispatch which has just been handed me, and which came over the wires a few hours ago. It reads:

WASHINGTON.—The United States intends to go ahead with large contributions to the United Nations despite the failure of the General Assembly to lower the boom on its big power delinquents, U.S. sources said today.

This means U.S. payments of about $200 million this year to the United Nations and related agencies, regardless of whether Russia, France, and others in arrears pay their assessed I O U's.

How will that sound around the world? Other nations will say, "The United States offers to buy the United Nations and pay $200 million for it."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we do so, we shall have reneged on article 19.

Mr. AIKEN. If the United Nations were reorganized, we would not give up our veto power. We would not agree to pay the United Nations for keeping a police force in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, or possibly in Puerto Rico, or in other areas. We would not agree to do it. We must simply reach an understanding, in order that we may look forward with some optimism to a cessation of hostilities in southeast Asia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator from Montana has said, the great difficulty is that we are going ahead with these loans, and the educational fund, and in carrying forward the peacekeeping functions simply on the basis that we are going to finance them.

Mr. AIKEN. I will not be a party to the making of an offer for the United Nations so that it will be a U.S. instrument.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would not happen if the United Nations and its Security Council were functioning in the way they were intended to function.

Mr. AIKEN. The U.N. as it is today represents the end of one phase of international cooperation. We cannot stop our efforts to cooperate with other countries of the world in an effort to seek peace. We cannot say that every country can wage war if it so desires.

We shall now enter another phase. We can enter it by straightening out the affairs of the United Nations now. We can enter the next phase by knocking the U.N. completely out of the picture and perhaps trying to start another organization with more compatible membership, as we have in SEATO, SENTO, and NATO, and then after a while we [redacted] that the memberships of those organizations are not so compatible.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Coming from the section of the country from which the Senator from Vermont and I come, we wish to see the United Nations continue if possible.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry that we are not getting more support from the people with sound views in our area of the country. For a long time I have not received letters in support of the U.N. Those people have found their outlets for crusading elsewhere.

But we must remember that the atom bomb does not care what one's race, creed, or color is, or whether one is rich or poor, or whether he lives on a farm, on Beacon Street, or wherever it might be.

The most important thing in the world today is to avoid an escalation of the Asian war until it reaches a point at which it becomes a general war, and finally a total war with the use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate what the Senator has said. I could not agree with him more. The great problem that faces the Congress in the next 2 or 3 months is how to work out the financial aspects of the operation of the United Nations so that it does not become totally dependent on the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. The $200 million would not be totally lost if the United States paid the lion's share of all the expenses. But a good share of it would go down the drain, and it would not gain us respect in the rest of the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would go down the drain because it would not accomplish the objective for which the organization was intended.

Mr. AIKEN. It could not accomplish it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator's opinion means a great deal to me.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I did not wish this opportunity to pass without expressing my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Vermont for a very timely discussion of a problem that will confront the Congress and our Nation in the very near future. The majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] have laid the groundwork for what will be a great congressional debate and, indeed, a great debate all over this Nation, as to the future of the United Nations.

Mr. AIKEN. All over the world.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; as the Senator has said, there will be a great debate all over the world. I have no doubt about it.

I had the privilege of serving as a delegate to the United Nations in the 19th session of the United Nations, which was the last session. I am somewhat familiar with the problem which the distinguished Senator from Vermont has mentioned. The problem of financing is a difficult one. While my service at the United Nations was most interesting, it was also frustrating. The problem of financing must be solved. It will be solved, as I see it, through the future actions of the Congress, particularly the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is a member.

One of the privileges of serving on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is to sit next to the Senator from Vermont. There I have the privilege of enjoying his sound and constructive advice time and time again. He has again demonstrated to the Senate and to the country the problem which is confronting us in the United Nations.

Very frankly, as one who spent the entire month of December at the United Nations, to which we contribute $29.3 million—32 percent of the cost of the United Nations aside from the special fund—I should like to say very frankly that we shall either have to increase that amount or we shall have to decide what the future of the United Nations shall be. In my opinion, the answer to that question will be determined in this very body. The groundwork has been laid this afternoon for weeks of discussion of that question. We should get at it.

I agree that we must have some international organization where nations can meet and discuss world problems. Such an organization is necessary in an age in which the world has shrunk so in size, both in communications and in transportation, so that it is important that we act. It is best that we get underway soon.

The proposal may not be the best way to handle the problem. But the determining factor will be the financing. I well remember the occasion on which the Senator discussed the $100 million bond issue. Having served in the United Nations, I should like to say, if I remember correctly, that $85 million of those bonds have been invested, used, and the funds carried into other countries.

Mr. AIKEN. We have put in approximately $80 million.

Mr. CARLSON. $80 million?

Mr. AIKEN. About that.

Mr. CARLSON. If I remember correctly, the indebtedness of the United Nations for peacekeeping operations is around $154 million at the present time.

Mr. AIKEN. The amount is not insurmountable if we get at it now.

I have purposely refrained from saying today how I would do it. That is the business of the executive branch. The members of the executive branch have enough brains to do it. It remains to be seen whether they have enough wisdom and determination to do it.

But if those in authority desire a strong United Nations, we can have a strong United Nations. If the great powers get together we can do so. I am inclined to think that that is entirely possible. Those of us who make the appropriations must decide whether we shall appropriate money to sustain a growing concern or whether we shall appropriate money to sustain a growing rathole.

Mr. CARLSON. And also whether we shall appropriate money to support an ineffective organization.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. There has been some talk about sending the problem of Vietnam to the United Nations. What could the United Nations do in relation to that problem when they will not even pay for the peacekeeping operations in the Congo? In that respect it has been ineffectual.

Mr. AIKEN. My major reason for speaking as I have today is to put the United Nations in such shape that we can look hopefully toward a cessation of bloodshed in Asia and get away from the fear that some day, before too long, we might be engaged in total war.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator that this is the time when the United Nations will become a strong international agency or fall by the wayside.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will indulge me a moment before I start on my own address, I, too, would like to congratulate the Senator for a magnificently provocative address. I not only consider the Senator my senior in the Senate, but I honor and love him as a great American and a great friend. When he shows his eternal youth, as he did today, in so provocative a statement, it is a great joy to those like myself who are interested in these subjects. I should like, if I may, to clarify the point because I think I know the Senator's mind on this subject very well. It seems to me that what the Senator has said in effect is this: No matter what we do about the money, the important thing is the authority. In other words, the United Nations, having shown a certain capability through the General Assembly to do something about peacekeeping, is now denuded of a valuable authority because it handles its money business unwisely. This would be a great loss to the world, and even if we begin to recognize that article 19 is a nullity and, in reality, if we are to have money for peacekeeping operations it must be contributed voluntarily—even if we got to that point—preserving the authority of the General Assembly so it could authorize peacekeeping operations, even if financed voluntarily, is extremely valuable.

It seems to me that the Senator has separated the wheat from the chaff. It is the authority that we wish to preserve. We do not desire that to go down the drain because of the fact that the money equation has been badly handled.

Mr. AIKEN. As I said, I have some ideas, and, I know that the Senator from New York has some, as to what could be done. First, before it can be done, we must get away from obstinacy. If we wish to put the U.N. on the road as a going concern, I think we can do it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Vermont for his magnificent address today.

I ask unanimous consent that I may call for a quorum without losing my right to the floor.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE USE OF RIOT GAS IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have in mind making a statement on Vietnam today. Before I address myself to that subject, I should like to say a word about the flurry over the use of so-called riot gas in Vietnam, which has dominated the news for the past few days.

It happens that on this particular subject I have a slight amount of expertness, because during World War II I served as an officer in the Chemical Warfare Service of the U.S. Army. I can attest to Senators that the gas used—and I have checked it—is a riot gas. It is not a lethal or asphyxiating or poison gas, as described in the Geneva convention, with which I had a great deal to do when I was in the Army, because I was Secretary of the Inter-Allied Committee on Chemical Warfare. So I can assure Senators that we are not involved in any undertaking which concerns the use of gas as described in the Geneva convention, even though we are not a party to that convention.

Second, the type of gas being used has been used in emergencies for many years in riot situations and, therefore, it is not a new or unusual preparation for this situation.

It may be that our officials all the way down the line, including those who did not inform the President, should have foreseen the propaganda outcries and should have avoided the use of this gas or not allowed others to have it for use. This would have been much wiser in the interests of our Nation, a more sound decision, and stronger evidence of responsibility.

But I do not see that this incident is more than a flurry. I hope we shall not be diverted from the main point by the commotion which is taking place and which is especially being boomed by Communist propagandists. I am quite confident that the gas clouds will shortly blow away. We should put the issue in focus and not allow it to divert us from the basic Vietnamese situation, which is so critical, and to which I shall now address myself.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in order to incorporate in a definitive way my views on the subject of the war in Vietnam, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask that it be received and referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 29

Whereas the Congress by joint resolution approved August 10, 1964, declared that it "approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression" and further declared that "the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed forces, to assist any member or protocol state of the southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom," and the President has exercised authority under such joint resolution; and

Whereas the Communist regime in North Vietnam continues its deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom; and

Whereas the United States is continuing to assist the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military, or political ambitions in that area, but desires only that these peoples should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way; and

Whereas questions have been raised at home and abroad as to the willingness of the United States to join in negotiations for an end to hostilities in Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the United States is determined to assist in ending aggression against South Vietnam by the Communist regime in North Vietnam; and the Congress approves and supports the actions of the President, including the use of the Armed Forces, in the defense of the territorial integrity and political independence of South Vietnam, as being in the national interest; (2) that the objectives of the United States are to bring about the cessation of hostilities and the restoration of peace, tranquility, and security in South Vietnam; and to assist South Vietnam in obtaining a full opportunity for self-determination, religious freedom, economic and social progress, the establishment and strengthening of free institutions, and the enjoyment of friendly relations with its neighbors; and (3) that the United States is ready, whenever there is any willingness by the other appropriate parties to do so, to undertake honorable negotiation to attain these objectives.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be listed as a cosponsor of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for many weeks now, along with other Senators, I have backed the President in the use of airpower against North Vietnam, while at the same time requesting that the President advance the general principles on which we are willing to negotiate for a cease-fire and peace in Vietnam. As a logical sequel to the resolution adopted August 10, 1964, to reflect subsequent events and a new phase of the situation following the attack on U.S. ships in the Bay of Tonkin, and to express what I believe should be our policy in South Vietnam, I have today submitted a concurrent resolution concerning this issue.

I should like to read the operative part of it:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the United States is determined to assist in ending aggression against South Vietnam by the Communist regime in North Vietnam; and the Congress approves and supports the actions of the President, including the use of the Armed Forces, in the defense of the territorial integrity and political independence of South Vietnam, as being in the national interest; (2) that the objectives of the United States are to bring about the cessation of hostilities and the restoration of peace, tranquility, and security in South Vietnam; and to assist South Vietnam in obtaining a full opportunity for self-determination, religious freedom, economic and social progress, the establishment and strengthening of free institutions, and the enjoyment of friendly relations with its neighbors; and (3) that the United States is ready, whenever there is any willingness by the other appropriate parties to do so, to undertake honorable negotiation to attain these objectives.

Mr. President, the concurrent resolution first confirms our determination to continue to help South Vietnam put an end to aggression from the North. In this, there must be no doubt that the Congress is behind the President.

Next, the concurrent resolution approves and supports the President's actions to date in defending the territorial integrity and political independence of South Vietnam.

Third, the concurrent resolution expresses our desire to restore peace.

Fourth, it states our interest in the self-determination of South Vietnam as well as in its religious freedom, economic and social progress, free institutions, and friendly international relations.

Finally, and most importantly, the concurrent resolution asserts our willingness to enter into honorable negotiations.

It in no way alters or supersedes the joint resolution of August 10, 1964; it is in the nature of a needed supplement to it. It is a supplement because if an honorable peace is not obtainable by negotiations—and let our fellow countrymen know this well—if an honorable peace is not obtainable by negotiation, the United States is committed to continue in the struggle with all that this implies. I say this with the greatest responsibility as a Senator of the United States who represents nearly 18 million people. We cannot pull out as we stand now. We can only honorably perform our commitments, unless the ground is washed out from under us and it becomes absolutely clear that there is no will to resist in South Vietnam.

My added purpose in submitting the concurrent resolution stems from an acute awareness of a grave danger that we face in our efforts to contain Communist expansion in southeast Asia, a danger that is too seldom mentioned, perhaps because it is the one that should most readily be dealt with.

I speak of the danger caused by an erosion of support among the American people themselves for the effort in South Vietnam which is so essential to our national interest, to freedom, and to peace.

One gage of the gravity of this danger is congressional mail, and a recent survey by U.S. News & World Report among the Senators of both parties and all political colorations shows this mail running heavily against our military action in Vietnam. For months, though it may sound extreme, my own mail has been running in some weeks as high as 50 to 1 against our Vietnam operation, and contacts with other sources of constituent opinion bear out the fact that much misunderstanding exists on this issue.

One factor which contributes to misunderstanding is the lack of authoritative information concerning the will of the South Vietnamese people. More and more, in recent weeks, the desire of the South Vietnamese to carry on the struggle and continue to receive our assistance has been questioned.

How can we find out what the South Vietnamese people really want? I certainly am not suggesting a Gallup poll in South Vietnam. I am suggesting an examination of all the evidence available, including evidence from areas under Government control, areas under Vietcong control, performance of the South Vietnam forces, ability or inability of the Vietcong to carry on their activities with the aid or consent of the people, the demonstrated ability or inability of nonregular, so-called militia forces to defend villages and hamlets against Vietcong attack, reports of U.S. forces in the field, and reports of correspondents and others who have traveled in the countryside and been able to observe the people and communicate with them.

I am sure the President has access to more facts and more reliable information than the rest of us, and can, therefore, come to a more considered and more accurate conclusion. I am also sure that the American people would like to hear that conclusion and the reasons for it. They would take his word for it, but they want to hear it from him.

If the President concludes that a majority of the people are determined to resist and want our help—as I assume is implicit in the continuance of our presence there—the announcement of this conclusion and the evidence on which it is based would serve to gain further support for our policy.

But the principal cause of the danger of loss of support for our policy is that many Americans are worried and confused over our aims and our plans in South Vietnam. In short, they need reassurance that we do, in fact, have an attainable goal and are taking all proper measures to attain it.

This danger of erosion of American support can be met, in my judgment, if the President deals with this question: Since our aim is not unconditional surrender, what are the general principles on which we are willing to negotiate a settlement of the Vietnamese situation?

The President, in his press conference last Saturday, again restated the will of the United States to assist the South Vietnamese people in fighting aggression from Communist North Vietnam and to do all necessary to stop this aggression. He has the support of Congress—and he certainly has my support—for the actions taken so far to make good this commitment, including the air attacks against military targets in North Vietnam. But we all know that the retaliatory use of airpower alone is not a policy in a complex political and social, as well as military, situation. It is only a means to an end, and the more the people and the world know about that end, the greater the likelihood of attaining it.

It is clear that the political problems of the south will not be resolved only by military pressure on the north. It is also clear that we are not engaged in South Vietnam for an "unconditional surrender," which, as everyone knows, would be impossible at this time. And let us remember that historically we have made declarations to deal with this implication in World War I and II and Korea. The declarations at the time of World War I were contained in President Wilson's famous 14 points. In World War II, there were declarations of intent by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. In the Korean war, the general principles involved in achieving a settlement were declared. In my view, the general principles for honorable negotiations—and I state these specifically because we must get down to cases so that the American people are assured that we have an attainable objective in taking the tremendous risk which we are taking in South Vietnam—should include:

First. A cease-fire halting both the fighting in South Vietnam and the air strikes against North Vietnam.

Second. Establishment of an International Commission on Vietnam to supervise the cease-fire, a prohibition against infiltration of arms or insurgent personnel into South Vietnam or any compromise of the territorial or administrative integrity either of North or South Vietnam, withdrawal of North Vietnamese military and paramilitary personnel from South Vietnam with implementation guaranteed by a peacekeeping force of the International Commission or a composite force of the type utilized in the settlement in Korea, and withdrawal of such United States and allied forces as will suit the type of settlement arrived at.

Third. Establishment of a government in South Vietnam with free institutions, perhaps guaranteed by the United Nations or otherwise internationally guaranteed, and with provisions for imple-

menting a program of social and economic reform, which is crucial to the peace and prosperity of South Vietnam.

Fourth. Normalization of trade and other economic relations between North and South Vietnam.

I point out with respect to this fourth point that South Vietnam is the traditional granary for North Vietnam and that there is a tremendous potential in the economic development of the Mekong Delta. What could be done by international financing of the Mekong project could be of enormous value to both parts of Vietnam.

Of course, the give and take of real negotiations would temper any plan of this kind—elements would be added, subtracted, and modified. Nor do I assert that this is the only—or even the best—settlement plan. I put it forth merely as the kind of result which might be sought by negotiation.

The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to show our willingness to undertake negotiations. But it takes two to negotiate, and one side may have to be convinced by the firmness and determination of the other that the bargaining table is the best solution. This is why I, and other Senators, backed the firmness and determination manifested by the United States in recent weeks in our positive response to North Vietnamese belligerency. Coupled with this response, however, must be an indication that we are ready to negotiate.

There are dangers in such a course as there are dangers in every course. The world is not a safe and easy place, and we cannot act at all if we are unwilling to act boldly and wisely, with ultimate faith in our own strength and purpose.

The Korean settlement reached with the Communists after 2 long years of negotiation at Panmunjom was not, as was true of Laos—though we took a risk in both cases—a settlement we made only to have our hopes dashed.

A settlement in South Vietnam is, in itself, not contrary to our interests so long as it is not just the first step toward a Communist state. We have not had total success with such solutions, but we have not had total failure either.

Such a plan may contain disadvantages quickly evident to those who possess information not available to all, not the least of which may be that it is just not feasible. But it is not enough to respond to aggression, although that is required. It is not enough to express our determination to prevent the Communists from taking over South Vietnam, although that is our goal. We must also determine what kind of negotiated settlement we are prepared to consider and, without necessarily supplying the details, state its general principles to the world and, most important of all, to the American people.

I close as I began, on the proposition that the greatest danger which faces us with respect to our policy, is a dangerous erosion of the support of the American people because they are unclear as to our objectives and how our policy should be working to attain them. I believe—and I have suggested the way in which this can be done—that if we state our objectives, and they are limited and reasonable objectives, this will consolidate the American people behind the efforts of our Government, which I am convinced are right.

Certain historic confrontations have taken place in the recent history of our country. There was one in Berlin. There was one in Cuba. Today there is one in Vietnam. Each of these was tremendously portentous, containing the potential of a great world conflagration which, nonetheless, must be risked in the interest of freedom.

If we are running great risks—and they are great indeed—the least we can do is solidify the support of our own people, and of the people of the world, by outlining limited objectives and sticking to them, even if we do not have complete and final success. Certainly we should stick to them as the basis of a settlement which we all know must be made to bring to a conclusion the trying situation in Vietnam.

I hope that these ideas will be considered by the administration and that we may soon clarify the issue and the development of our policy.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, is the Senator preparing to make a speech?

Mr. COOPER. I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw his request?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

WILLIAM C. FEAZEL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana, with the understanding that in doing so I shall not lose my right to the floor. I should also like to state that I intend to make a statement today on South Vietnam. It is not a long one. However, I have already yielded to many Senators, and I know that the Senator from Louisiana must make his claim, so I am glad to yield to him; but then I wish to make my statement.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Kentucky for yielding to me at this time.

Last week, Louisiana lost one of its truly great citizens. I refer to my predecessor in this body, the Honorable William C. Feazel.

My admiration for Bill Feazel has been such that his picture has hung alongside my desk from the day I took the oath of office in 1948. Bill Feazel was of humble birth in Union Parish in North Louisiana. He knew what it was to want for the necessities of life. Yet he came up the hard way to become a member of the State legislature and an extremely successful businessman in the oil and gas industry. The thing that so much impressed me about Bill Feazel was that his successes in life never turned his head and his heart never ceased to beat in sympathy and understanding for those less fortunate than he.

Senator Feazel possessed a lifetime interest in State and national affairs. It seemed to many of us that he felt he could render a greater contribution to his fellow man by spending his money supporting people whom he deemed worthy of public office than in almost any other way. He was a lifelong Democrat and he supported people whom he believed to be sincere in serving the interest of all the people, regardless of the cost to him personally.

I recall early in the year 1948 that Bill Feazel had been the principal financial backed of my uncle, the late Gov. Earl K. Long. His contribution during his campaign ran into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. At that time, he assured persons interested in the oil and gas business that Earl Long would be fair to the oil and gas industry.

When Earl Long became Governor of Louisiana, he was confronted with promises he had made which would require an increase in State taxes of a figure that exceeded $60 million annually, to pay the cost of welfare payments to the aged, a veterans' bonus, free school lunches, and a major pay raise for all school teachers. Several of us advised the then Governor that it would be virtually impossible to finance such a program without an extremely heavy increase in taxes on the oil and gas industry, which accounted for about 40 percent of the industrial activity of Louisiana.

On that occasion, a number of outstanding representatives of the oil industry went to Bill Feazel, pointing out that the Governor's program would virtually treble the taxes they were paying. They contended that this constituted a breach of faith, particularly insofar as Bill Feazel was concerned. It was pointed out to him that the increase in taxes would cost him several millions of dollars. On that occasion, Bill Feazel told those good men that the new Governor should never have made such promises if he had not intended to keep them. He said that if the Governor thought it was necessary to levy such heavy taxes on the oil industry in order to keep his promises, he was prepared to pay his share of it. That is exactly what happened.

It was my privilege to enjoy the friendship and support of Bill Feazel throughout my entire political career. He had a great number of friends whom he had also favored with his friendship and loyalty. It was my experience that he never let any of them down. Nor did he ever turn his back on any friend, no matter what humiliation or misfortune they might have suffered. No man that I have met in my lifetime so consistently urged me to do what my conscience told me was right about public affairs, regardless of the consequences it might entail.

Bill Feazel is mourned by his widow, Cynthia Day Feazel, his loyal and devoted helpmate throughout life, and his two daughters, Lallage Feazel and Gertrude Feazel Anderson. He leaves behind him two fine grandsons, Hank Anderson and Bill Anderson, whom we hope to see continue in the tradition of their

grandfather. To all the members of his family we extend our deepest sympathy.

In our moment of sadness in the loss of a dear friend and a good public servant, it is comforting for those of us who believe in the Almighty, to know that there is a reward beyond this place of toil where the good deeds of men like Bill Feazel are not overlooked.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the situation in Vietnam and to make one chief point: That the President make it clear to the people of the United States, and to the nations of the world, that the United States is willing to determine through negotiations if a peaceful, just, and honorable settlement of the war in Vietnam is possible.

Let me emphasize the single point that I desire to make. It is that the President make it clear again that the United States is willing to enter into negotiations. I am sure that this is the President's intention, but I believe that many people in this country, many of our allies, and many other nations, are not certain.

I give my reasons for believing this to be true. I believe that our Government is prescribing conditions as a prerequisite to negotiations which will not be accepted.

The Communist Chinese and the North Vietnamese have announced as a condition of negotiation that the United States must withdraw from South Vietnam. This is a condition which the President rightfully says cannot, and will not be accepted. But our Government has imposed its own condition—that it is not prepared to enter into negotiations until the intervention and aggression of North Vietnam ceases. This is the object of our presence in Vietnam, but I think it unlikely that the Communists will agree to this condition for negotiations, as we will not agree to their condition that the United States withdraw. It is a kind of demand from both sides for unconditional surrender. I believe it more reasonable to say that we are prepared to enter into true negotiations, for in the course of negotiation, the United States could marshal its arguments and influence against the intervention of the Communists, and seek a settlement consistent with our objectives in South Vietnam.

We will remember that in Korea, and in Vietnam in 1954 and 1955, no such conditions were imposed by either side prior to negotiations, but a cease-fire was sought; then through negotiations, the effort was made to attain the objectives that we still seek today. We can never accept the conditions now imposed by the Communists, and it is reasonable to say that they will not accept ours. The result is that as long as both hold to these conditions, there is little chance of negotiation.

There is no evidence that the Communists are willing to negotiate at all, or that they will agree to any settlement which would end their support of the so-called "war of national liberation" which they have initiated. The support of wars of national liberation has become a declared policy of the Communist world. Nevertheless, I make my proposal for a clearer statement of the willingness of the United States to negotiate, for two reasons.

First, it is my view that the strong action taken by the President of the United States has given notice to the Communists that we do not intend to be driven out, which I doubt can be made clearer. If our bombing is accelerated, it could reach a point where the resistance and intransigence of the Communists will be hardened, and the intervention of the Communist Chinese and Russia made more likely. And I must say that the use of harmless gas, while it could be justified in defense of our ultimate security, is wrong in the present situation and is more likely to harden the position of the Communists.

My second reason for urging a clearer United States position with regard to negotiation is that it is the tradition of the United States, and one consonant with our system of government, that we take every reasonable step to reach a peaceful settlement without resort to war. We do differentiate our system of government from that of Communist China, the Soviet Union and other Communist countries in our willingness to make this effort.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is constantly interesting and exciting to me that at times men's minds "zero in" in the same way. I did not in any way consult with the Senator from Kentucky. I did not know that he would speak today on the subject of Vietnam.

Mr. COOPER. I have had the same feeling about the Senator's statesmanlike speech. I did not know that he would speak today on this subject.

Mr. JAVITS. It gives one almost a creepy feeling to read words which express essentially the basic idea that there is something lacking; namely, our declaration that we are truly ready to negotiate—not on grounds of unconditional surrender, not on the basis of "You get out, or we will not get out; but let us stay where we are, and negotiate"—truly ready to negotiate.

I am grateful to the Senator from Kentucky. It is typical of the extraordinary qualities that he brings to the Senate.

It is interesting to know that men who are charged with this great responsibility, as we are, should come to the same conclusion; and this is an extraordinary example of it.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the generous remarks of the Senator from New York. It is rather interesting to note that without any consultation we are expressing similar ideas. I am very grateful to the Senator.

I do not know that there is any substance to the statements that are heard, that we intend to accelerate our action in North Vietnam.

At times there are rumors also, of the old theory of preventive war. Knowing the President as a man of peace and honor, I say categorically that it is not his theory or purpose. But there may be some who hold to this theory. I do not believe it is consistent with the tradition of our country, or with our system of free government.

When I speak of a clearer statement of willingness to negotiate, I hope that our country will make it clear that we are willing to accept the offices of the Geneva Conference, of the United Nations, or perhaps a "community" of concerned nations, of which the Prime Minister of Canada, the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, spoke in New York City, on March 5, 1965.

I believe that Mr. Pearson's suggestion, that a community of responsible and concerned nations might be organized to participate in a settlement, and to police it, is worthy of the most serious consideration. I quote from his speech:

> We need cool heads to assess the meaning of the struggle in southeast Asia. We need hard reason to guide our reactions and decisions. We should not permit either anger or anxiety to sway our judgment.
>
> The first principle is surely that mankind can no longer afford war in the atomic age. This statement might seem a truism were it not for the fact that some Communist governments make an explicit reservation—that so-called "wars of national liberation" are exceptions and must be tolerated by human society as a permissible form of state action.
>
> We have to scotch this dangerous illusion. Assistance given across frontiers in support of local revolts is as great a violation of basic rights of nations and basic concepts of international law as invasion by any other means. Every form of outside interference by force is aggression. Unchecked, it will lead by escalation to general war. Today, we cannot afford any "permissible" kinds of international violence. All must be outlawed.

Mr. President, this is very significant, because it indicates the support of Canada for our basic aims in southeast Asia. I quote further from Mr. Pearson's address:

> As I see it, the struggle in southeast Asia today is basically an attempt to establish the principle that armed assistance from outside to "wars of national liberation" constitutes aggression and must be checked.
>
> How to do this is the concern of the whole international community. It follows, therefore, that the whole community has a responsibility to see that such situations are brought under control. If a single power has to undertake this task, there arises the danger of widening the struggle into general war. So the nations of the world must be ready to produce an alternative.
>
> Such an alternative could lie in the international community itself taking over the responsibility of sealing off frontiers against guerrilla infiltration and massively and effectively—and I mean effectively—policing

and enforcing international agreements that aim to check and control local hostilities. If the Geneva Agreements of 1954 had provided for supervision and policing and enforcement in this way, the infiltration of Laos and South Vietnam from the outside could have been checked in time.

Today, therefore, the aim of the international community must be to secure conditions in southeast Asia in which, under international control and international supervision and effective international policing, states in that area can work out their own affairs and conduct their own policies without interference from any neighbor or any outside power.

If out of the present awful risk of escalation, we can move to such an international settlement, then the United States can be spared the onerous and ungrateful task of acting alone against aggression, and the world will have taken one more step toward effective and impartial organization of international peace.

If diplomatic negotiations could be held on the basis I have just outlined, then resumption of the Geneva Conference of 1954 would be well worthwhile.

We must seize this opportunity, from the danger we face, before it is too late.

I am sure that we could consider seriously the suggestion of the Government of Canada, a good friend, and one which supports our basic purposes in southeast Asia.

Only a few weeks ago, February 13, the Canadian delegation of the International Control Commission in Vietnam, filed a dissenting statement to the majority report of the Commission, stating explicitly that recent events, including American action, were the result of the intensification of the aggressive policy of the Government of North Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to have this report printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not believe that we would have anything to lose if the President of the United States were to say clearly again, and without the condition of which I have spoken, that the United States is willing to undertake negotiations. We do not have to enter into negotiations if the Communists impose the conditions of our withdrawal, and of course, if negotiations were undertaken, we would not be required to accept any settlement unless it were consonant with the objectives of our country and with standards of international decency and law.

In making this statement, I wish to make it clear that I am not recommending or suggesting that the United States withdraw from its commitments in South Vietnam. The SEATO treaty, approved by the Senate in 1955, committed the United States and all signatories to extend protection to South Vietnam upon the request of its government and upon approval of the signatory governments through their constitutional processes. In August 1964, after the attack on American naval vessels in the Bay of Tonkin, Congress adopted by an almost unanimous vote a joint resolution approving and supporting the determination of the President: "to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." The second part of the resolution is very important in consideration of the present situation:

SEC. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

South Vietnam along with Cambodia and Laos are protocol states.

It was my view at the time of the debate last August—and I said so in the debate—as it is my view today, that through the adoption of this resolution, the Congress supported the constitutional authority of the President, and extended to him any additional authority that he might need in order to take such steps as he might believe proper to defend the security of the United States and to halt the aggression against South Vietnam.

I believe that last August we expressed the condition that the Congress should act through its constitutional processes, and we confirmed to the President the authority that he is using today.

The statement that I make today is consistent with the position that I have held for years.

It has been a long time ago, but in 1954 I spoke in the Senate urging that negotiations be undertaken respecting the problem of Vietnam, rather than the use of our own troops.

Last April, I made the statement in the Senate that I thought it was time for negotiations. Last year, I supported the resolution which reinforced the authority of the President of the United States. I was glad that I did so. But in a speech in the Senate on August 6, I expressed my hope that the President of the United States would use all of the great powers of his office and of our country to find a peaceful and just solution in South Vietnam.

The problem of Vietnam is one of long standing. The United States has been engaged in Vietnam since 1954, and for 8 years before, we were providing assistance to the French. Today, except for the consideration of similar problems that might arise in the future, there is little point of talking about the past. We are required to deal with the existing situation.

I think it just and fair to say that the situation in Vietnam is one which President Johnson inherited. We have confidence in him. We know that he speaks truly when he says that it is not his intention, or the intention of our Government or its people to expand the war, and that we seek only to deter, and if necessary to prevent, the wrongful action of the Communists, which contravenes all concepts of international law. But it is right to continue to make every effort to find, difficult as it is, a just solution for the settlement of the situation in South Vietnam, without war.

Mr. President, I summarize the point of my talk. I recognize that it is difficult to find any avenue toward negotiations. I believe that it is necessary for the President to make it clear that we are willing to enter true negotiations without conditions imposed upon us by the Communists. On our part, I do not believe that we can reach negotiations by imposing as a prerequisite that the Communist cease their intervention, rightful as our position is. For then we stand in confrontation, with a position of unconditional surrender and with the possibility of war as the only arbiter.

Finally, if negotiations are possible—and no one can say whether they will be, it appears to me that the proposal of Mr. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada, a friend, and the leader of one of our best friends—Canada—that it might be possible to organize a community of concerned and responsible nations which would undertake responsibility toward negotiations and policing a just settlement.

I close by saying that, like many other Members of this body, I have had some experience in war—an experience which does not compare to that of those who were constantly in combat, but an experience which I value above all others. Anyone who has had such an experience knows, awesome as it is, that it does not make one less afraid or less courageous. It makes one determined to protect the security and honor of his country. But it makes one also more determined and thoughtful about seeking out every honorable course to avoid the possibility of war, perhaps the awful eventuality of a nuclear war, with all of the sorrow and disaster it would bring to our country and to humanity. If we cannot reach such a peaceful and honorable settlement in Vietnam, we stand together, supporting the President as we do now, to defend, at whatever cost, our security and our freedom.

STATEMENT OF THE CANADIAN DELEGATION TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSION—VIETNAM

The Canadian delegation considers it necessary to append a minority statement to the foregoing majority report.

2. The Canadian delegation agrees that the situation in Vietnam continues to be dangerously unstable, and events since February 7 in North and South Vietnam have provided a dramatic demonstration of this continuing condition. The delegation believes, however, that the causes of this situation must be seen in context and, therefore, reviewed in the framework of the Commission's full range of responsibilities under the Geneva Agreement. By concentrating on a very limited aspect of the situation in Vietnam, the majority report runs the serious risk of giving the members of the Geneva Conference a distorted picture of the nature of the problem in Vietnam and its underlying causes.

3. In reporting on the events in North and South Vietnam since February 7, the Canadian delegation, therefore, deems it necessary to set these events in their proper perspective. In the view of the Canadian delegation, they do not stem from any essentially new factors in the situation in Vietnam, nor can they be seen in isolation; rather, they are dramatic manifestations of a continuing instability which has, as its most important cause, the deliberate and persistent pursuit of aggressive but largely

covert policies by North Vietnam directed against South Vietnam. The Commission's special report of 1962 drew attention to the fact that "armed and unarmed personnel, arms, munitions, and other supplies have been sent from the zone in the North to the zone in the South with the object of supporting, organizing, and carrying out hostile activity" and that "the PAVN has allowed the zone in the North to be used for inciting, encouraging, and supporting hostile activities in the zone in the South aimed at the overthrow of the administration in the South," thus showing, beyond reasonable doubt, violation of various articles of the Geneva Agreement by the People's Army of North Vietnam. This judgment by the Commission was based on conclusions reached by the Commission's Legal Committee after exhaustive examination of allegations and evidence pertaining to this problem. The final paragraphs of those conclusions read as follows:

"The legal committee concludes (reference paragraphs 742 to 746 and paragraph 754 in section VI) that it is the aim of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party (the ruling party in the zone in the North) to bring about the overthrow of the administration in the South. In September 1960, the third congress of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party held in Hanoi (in the zone in the North) passed a resolution calling for the organization of a 'front' under the leadership of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party for the overthrow of the administration in the South. Such a 'Front for Liberation of the South' was, in fact, constituted under the sponsorship of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party. There are present and functioning in the zone in the South, branches of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party and the Front for Liberation of the South along with its armed branches, namely, the 'Forces for Liberation of the South' and the 'People's Self-Defence Armed Forces.' The Vietnam Lao Dong Party and the Front for Liberation of the South have the identical aim of overthrowing the administration in the South. The Vietnam Lao Dong Party, the Front for Liberation of the South, the Forces for Liberation of the South and the People's Self-Defence Armed Forces have disseminated in the zone in the South propaganda seeking to incite the people to oppose and overthrow the administration in the South. There exists and functions a 'voice' of the Front for Liberation of the South and a 'Liberation Press Agency' which assist in the above-mentioned activities. It is probable that Hanoi Radio also has assisted in the said activities. Propaganda literature of the Front for the Liberation of the South and in favour of the activities of the Front has been published in the zone in the North and has been distributed abroad by the official representatives of the DRVN.

"The Legal Committee further concludes that:

1. The Vietnam Lao Dong Party in the zone in the North, the various branches of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party in the zone in the South, the Front for Liberation of the South, the Forces for Liberation of the South and the People's Self-Defence Armed Forces have incited various sections of the people residing in the zone in the South, including members of the Armed Forces of the South, to oppose the administration in the South to overthrow it by violent means and have indicated to them various means of doing so.

2. Those who ignored their exhortation and continued to support the administration in the South have been threatened with punishment and in certain cases such punishment has been effected by the carrying out of death sentences.

3. The aim and function of the Front for Liberation of the South, the Forces for Liberation of the South, and the People's Self-Defense Armed Forces are to organize and to carry out under the leadership of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party, hostile activities against the armed forces and the administration of the South by violent means aimed at the overthrow of the administration of the South.

"The legal committee concludes also that the PAVN has allowed the zone in the North to be used as a base for the organization of hostile activities in the zone in the South, including armed attacks, aimed at the overthrow of the administration in the South in violation of its obligations under the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam."

4. Since the date of its special report, the Commission has continued to receive from the South Vietnamese liaison mission complaints of an increasingly serious nature, alleging an intensification of aggression from the North. In these communications, the liaison mission has brought to the Commission's attention mounting evidence to show that the Government of North Vietnam has expanded its aggressive activities directed against the Government of South Vietnam and has infiltrated growing numbers of armed personnel and increasing amounts of military equipment into South Vietnam for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of South Vietnam by force. The liaison mission has informed the Commission that, as a result, the Government of South Vietnam has been obliged to request increased foreign aid for self-defense.

5. In its letter No. 383/PDVN/CT/TD/2 dated January 27, 1965 (attached as app. I), for example, the liaison mission has provided the Commission with details of secret bases and related installations established in South Vietnam with the support of the Government of North Vietnam and other Communist countries. In the same letter, the liaison mission has provided the Commission with a recapitulatory list of arms, munitions, and equipment of Communist origin, the seizure of which has been reported to the Commission since the date of the Commission's Special Report of June 2, 1962.

6. In letter No. 539/PDVN/CT/TD/2 dated February 12, 1965 (attached as app. II), the liaison mission has reported to the Commission that, during the period 1959 to 1964, more than 39,000 men have been introduced into South Vietnam from North Vietnam in violation of the Geneva agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam. The liaison mission has provided details of the selection, training, infiltration routes, arms and equipment of these men, based on declarations obtained from prisoners of war, defectors, and captured documents.

RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I desire to make a supplemental statement. I wish to make two modest suggestions supplementing what I have said today about the situation in Vietnam. To introduce my discussion of the first suggestion, I submit a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 93) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COOPER. I shall read the resolution:

That it is the sense of the Senate that the majority and minority leaders, together with the chairmen and ranking members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, should use their good offices to arrange for meetings of Senators who are not members of the two committees to be briefed fully by the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense concerning the situation in Vietnam, such groups to approximate 20 in number.

In past years I have urged this kind of procedure on the floor of the Senate in connection with defense matters before the Committee on Armed Services; for because of the complexity of modern weapons systems and the limitations of security, it has become almost impossible for those who are not members of the Committee on Armed Services to obtain much information about matters of defense.

To the suggestion that we can always attend hearings and read the record, I should like to say that it is not always practical to do so. If we do go, we cannot question those who testify. I have also found that often many portions of the transcripts of hearings are deleted on grounds of security. I remember that when I went to the Committee on Foreign Relations to read the record of the first Cuban episode, it was impossible, from reading it, to have any clear indication of what had happened because of deletions.

So I have submitted the resolution respectfully, but yet with the determination to call attention to this problem and as a means to urge the majority leader and the minority leader, and the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services—whom we respect and in whom we have confidence, to use their offices to urge the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to brief Senators who are not members of the two committees, in small groups not exceeding 20 in number. I believe we have the right and the duty to ask for this assistance because, as I have said, Congress has its responsibility concerning the most important situation that our country faces today.

My second suggestion concerns the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee is made up of outstanding Members of the Senate—Members who, by reason of their experience, access to wide and detailed information, and their personal stature, have the best opportunity to advise Congress and, indeed, give counsel to the executive branch of the Government. I know that they have met many times with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and perhaps with the President, and that they are deeply conscious of their responsibility. Nevertheless, because Vietnam is presumably the most important, critical problem relating to our security, and because it is interrelated with our policy all over the world, and because it holds the danger of war, I take the liberty of urging the Committee on Foreign Relations to devote its time and its knowledge to continued discussions of this problem, to ascertain if, as a committee, it can make helpful, constructive suggestions to the executive branch and to give greater advice to the Senate.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thought the Senator from Kentucky might be interested to know that the Secretary of Defense recently issued an order that all persons

who are serving in key positions in the Federal Government, including Members of Congress, are no longer eligible to be in the Reserve program, particularly the Ready Reserve program.

Prior to this time, many Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives were members of those units and were receiving regular weekly intelligence reports from the respective units to which we were attached. We have now been denied those reports by order of the Secretary of Defense.

I recently wrote to the Secretary of the Air Force, suggesting that even though we had been placed on the inactive list, he should supply us with the briefs, so that we, as Members of Congress, might know what was taking place, by means of a weekly, current reportorial style of briefing. I received an unequivocal answer that this could not be done within the Reserve program, and that the Department was not organized to act in any other way.

I have just finished sending the same type of request to the Secretary of Defense, hoping that all three services together could give us briefings on a weekly basis, so as to keep us up to date.

In my opinion, it is absolutely unreasonable for the State Department to expect us to deal with the extremely important matters that we have before us all the time, as the Senator from Kentucky has made explicitly clear in his excellent speech, but at the same time say that we will not be given the information on which to base logical judgments. It seems to me to be the height of irrationality for the executive branch to take this stand; but it is one that, up to date, the Department of Defense has been taking.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I understand he is talking about information which would ordinarily be given the members of the Committee on Armed Services. I appreciate his statement. What I am discussing is an issue that I believe is larger.

We are here as representatives of our States and, in a larger sense, representatives of our country in the discussion of and consideration of questions which are larger than the concerns of any State.

I know that crisis after crisis has occurred since World War II. When a crisis occurs, it is the one which is most dangerous and most important. But I have thought that Vietnam is one of the most difficult crises that this country has faced because its many factors have not obtained in other situations.

We know what our commitments are in Berlin. We know that there is a wide source of support from some of the NATO countries and certainly from the people and government of West Germany. There are other situations in the world where we have made our position clear, and where the conditions are favorable to our support.

But considering the instability of government in Vietnam, its distance away, and the activity of Communist China, I believe Vietnam to be one of the most difficult situations our country has faced since World War II.

It is for that reason that I have made these suggestions. The first would provide fuller information to the Senate. The second is a respectful suggestion that there is no more important duty for our Committee on Foreign Relations than to apply its great abilities and great intelligence to continued study and discussion of this problem in the quiet of its executive session, in an effort to assist the President and the executive branch in the solution of the problem and give the Senate its leadership.

In saying that, I do not want to divert attention from the chief point that I have wanted to make in my statement today. That point is that I believe it is incumbent upon our administration to remove impossible preconditions of negotiation as we reject the impossible conditions set by North Vietnam and Communist China and make the clearest signal possible that we are willing to enter true negotiations—to determine if a peaceful settlement, consistent with our honorable commitments and our security, is possible.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this request has been cleared with the minority leader. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate on Monday next.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

FARM UNION SEEKS DISTRICTING STAY

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, there came to my desk recently an article from the New York Times of Thursday, March 18, 1965, reporting that the Farmers' Union has just had a national meeting and supported the proposed constitutional amendment on legislative reapportionment.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed at this point in the RECORD, it being pertinent not only to the Senator who is now occupying the chair, but also being in conformity with my own opinion that it should be passed as soon as possible.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1965]

FARM UNION SEEKS DISTRICTING STAY—BACKS A MODIFIED VERSION OF POPULATION FORMULA

(By Donald Janson)

CHICAGO, March 17.—The National Farmers Union adopted today a policy of opposition to the Supreme Court ruling requiring reapportionment of State legislatures on the basis of population alone.

The vote, taken after more than an hour of spirited debate at the organization's annual convention represented a repudiation of the leadership in the Farmers Union.

The vote, weighted to reflect membership strength in the various States, was 112,540 to 89,947.

BATTLE FOR DOMINATION

Thus the Farmers Union joined the other major general farm organizations, the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation, in the battle by rural interests to retain a dominant role in State legislatures despite declining farm population.

The legislative pattern in most States has long been for representation based on population in one house and such considerations as area in the other.

This has made it possible for rural interests to continue to dominate one house in many States in the face of a population shift to the cities.

Of the farm groups, only the Farmers Union has been sharply divided on the issue. James G. Patton, Farmers Union president, has publicly supported the Supreme Court decision of equal representation for all as consistent with democratic principles. He and Glenn J. Talbott, vice president, voted with the minority today.

During the debate in the Grand Ballroom of the Sherman House, a director of the Oklahoma Farmers Union, Leland Stanford, shouted from the floor that "if Jim Patton and these other leaders of ours don't have the guts to speak up for farmers let's get them out of here."

MODIFICATION IS ASKED

Other speakers said opposition to the "one-man, one-vote" principal enunciated by the Supreme Court would not square with the Farmers Union policy of support of the Constitution and might alienate friendly Congressmen and labor unions.

The policy statement adopted by the Farmers Union calls for a constitutional amendment permitting States to apportion one house without primary regard to population.

It expresses the fear that urban-dominated legislatures might ignore the interests of farmers in tax, school and other legislation.

Adoption of the policy puts the Farmers Union in a rare alinement with its much more conservative rival, the Farm Bureau.

The Farm Bureau is conducting a drive to encourage State legislatures to petition Congress to call a constitutional convention to draw up an amendment that would set aside the Supreme Court ruling.

Thirty-four such State petitions are needed to force congressional action. Then, to become law, the amendment drawn would have to be approved by three-fourths of the States.

President Johnson sent the convention a message of concern "that there is such a disproportionate share of poverty in rural America." He pledged to strive to "recapitalize rural America and strengthen our family farm system of agriculture."

AIRLINE SERVICE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the development of air transportation has been one of the key factors in the economic expansion we have experienced in recent decades. Technological progress in aviation has been achieved through the combined efforts of aircraft manufacturers, the airline industry, and the Federal Government. Cooperation of individual cities has contributed also. It has been generally recognized that such development is so affected with the public interest as to justify the expenditure of public funds.

Each year we spend millions of dollars of tax funds for the construction of airports and for the development and operation of safety equipment and control of the airways. Developmental costs for new aircraft are subsidized indirectly through the defense program, and we are now proposing the direct subsidization of development of a supersonic airliner for commercial application. In the area of operational costs the Federal Government has, through the direct subsidy program, in effect, guaranteed profitability of our certificated carriers, all in the interest of insuring service adequate for the public convenience and necessity.

We hear a great deal these days about the necessity of maintaining U.S. leadership in international air travel. It appears that we seek to maintain this leadership by concentrating our efforts on the development of bigger and bigger planes that will fly higher and faster and can stay aloft for longer and longer distances without having to land to refuel, or to serve passengers.

Much is made of new speed records between the east and west coasts and between continents—with the elapsed time always measured, of course, from takeoff to landing rather than in terms of the total elapsed time from departure from residence or office to arrival at destination.

Our major trunk carriers are operating in the black and, for the most part, are no longer dependent upon operating subsidies. This is a development which is naturally pleasing to the taxpayers. This has been achieved despite such innovations as first-run movies in flight and other extras which, according to the advertisements of at least one carrier, make air travel so plush that passengers refuse to get off the plane when it lands.

This is called progress. And, in a way, it is progress. The difficulty is that unless one is flying from coast to coast or from one of the Nation's largest metropolitan areas to another, he is likely to find that there is less air service available today than there was 8 or 10 years ago.

For the passenger from New York to Los Angeles or to Miami a flight is usually available at just about any time of the day he may wish to depart, many of the flights being nonstop. Unfortunately, the same is not true if one wishes to go from Little Rock to Louisville.

The fact is that most of our State capitals and other cities in the Nation, with the exception of the very largest metropolitan areas, are serviced by fewer and fewer flights as our planes get bigger and faster. With respect to the major population centers in the State of Tennessee, this statement has been statistically confirmed by information supplied to me at my request by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I asked the CAB to compile for me the scheduled flights from the airports of Memphis, Nashville, Chattanooga, and Knoxville for the past 10 years. The CAB has furnished comprehensive information listing all scheduled flights at each of these airports to and from each of the 10 cities constituting the given airport's top-ranked origin and destination markets. Generally, this data confirms that the number of flights has declined substantially, notwithstanding the fact that the number of passengers has steadily increased.

It is true that larger planes, with more spaces, provide the same number of seats as do a larger number of planes with fewer spaces. But one flight a day to and from a given point simply does not provide service as adequate as would three flights even if the one flight were by a plane three times as large. The public convenience and necessity is better served by the wider choice of departure and arrival times.

Moreover, the larger planes at faster speeds do not necessarily cut down on travel time on intermediate range flights, for the simple reason that the large jets require larger runways at airports further removed from the actual points of departure and destination. I am not here suggesting that we should turn back the clock and scrap large jetplanes or such airports as Dulles International built to accommodate them. But, in traveling from Washington to Nashville, Tenn., one does not save time by driving to Dulles to use a jetplane. Nor is Nashville served by the jet which departs from Dulles, or New York and passes over Nashville at 20,000 or perhaps 35,000 feet, to land at Memphis, or Dallas, or some place else.

To determine the degree to which service has declined at Tennessee airports I shall now refer to certain of the statistical data supplied by the CAB. Generally, the number of flights from the named Tennessee airports to and from their major markets increased from 1954 to 1957. But 1957 seems to have been the high water mark as far as the number of available flights is concerned. Since then, with some exceptions to which I shall refer, the trend has been steadily downward.

MEMPHIS

Memphis is the largest city in Tennessee and is often called the hub of the midsouth area. With a population of approprimately 600,000 and growing rapidly, Memphis is a transportation and trade center for a large area, drawing from Arkansas, Mississippi, and Tennessee.

Memphis' major air passenger markets, as measured by total number of origin and destination passengers are New Lork, Chicago, Nashville, Atlanta, St. Louis, New Orleans, Dallas, Washington, Little Rock, and Birmingham. Total passengers to and from these cities increased from 161,000 in 1954 to 206,000 in 1957, and to 300,000 in 1963. Its heaviest traffic is with New York. In 1957 there were 14 daily flights from Memphis to New York, or 98 flights per week. In February 1965 there were 3 daily flights, 5 flights which operated 6 days per week and 1 which operated only on Saturday, a total of 52 flights for the week. The decline in flights is not quite as marked from New York to Memphis. In 1957 a passenger from New York could take any of 14 daily flights to Memphis. By February 1965 there were only 4 daily flights, plus 7 which fly 6 days a week. The total number of flights per week from New York to Memphis thus declined from 98 to 70. The combined number of flights to and from New York declined from 196 per week in 1957 to 122 in 1965. Meanwhile passengers to and from Memphis and New York increased from 29,500 in 1957 to 48,000 in 1963.

The total number of flights per week from Memphis to the 10 named cities, and from these cities to Memphis, increased slightly, from 1,170 in 1957 to 1,260 in February 1965. This increase is due primarily to a larger number of flights by local service carriers to relatively nearby points such as Little Rock and Nashville. There was also some increase in service to Chicago.

But service to and from Washington, as is the case with New York, declined sharply. In 1957 there were 70 weekly flights to Washington, and 70 from Washington to Memphis. By February 1965 service to Washington had declined to 45 flights per week, and service from Washington had declined to 60 flights per week.

Considering the increase in the population of Memphis, and the increase in airline passengers, the service now available to Memphis falls far short of what is required for adequate service to the public.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the number of scheduled flights per week to and from Memphis' 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets.

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

TABLE 1.—*Scheduled flights per week, Memphis, Tenn.*

Origin and destination	Sept. 1, 1957	Feb. 1, 1965
Memphis to New York	98	52
New York to Memphis	98	70
Memphis to Chicago	47	72
Chicago to Memphis	40	66
Memphis to Nashville	49	61
Nashville to Memphis	49	67
Memphis to Atlanta	54	68
Atlanta to Memphis	54	74
Memphis to St. Louis	34	52
St. Louis to Memphis	28	46
Memphis to New Orleans	47	59
New Orleans to Memphis	54	65
Memphis to Dallas	55	76
Dallas to Memphis	55	56
Memphis to Washington, D.C.	70	45
Washington, D.C., to Memphis	70	60
Memphis to Little Rock	83	103
Little Rock to Memphis	83	102
Memphis to Birmingham	48	xxxx 33
Birmingham to Memphis	54	33
Total	1,170	1,260

NASHVILLE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Nashville, Tennessee's capital city, has recently completed major airport improvements, with runways and other facilities fully adequate for the jet age. No similar progress is discernible with respect to the service available to Nashville by trunk airlines.

Nashville's 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets are New York, Atlanta, Memphis, Chicago, Knoxville, Washington, Louisville, Chattanooga, St. Louis, and Cincinnati. Passengers to and from these cities increased from 210,700 in 1957 to 266,300 in 1963. But the number of flights available per week to and from these cities declined from 1,110 in 1957 to 772 in February 1965.

Like Memphis, Nashville has experienced a sharp decline in available service to and from New York and Washington. In 1957, there were 96 flights per week to New York, and 96 from New York. Now there are 45 to New York—less than half of what it was in 1957, please note—and 52 per week from New York to Nashville.

In 1957, there were 63 flights per week to Washington from Nashville. Now there are only 41. The number of flights from Washington to Nashville has declined from 69 to 47 per week.

Service from Nashville to Chicago and return has declined more than 50 percent. Service to Louisville has declined almost 50 percent.

The lack of timely departure and arrival times result in more than mere inconvenience to travelers. A real economic impact is involved. In 1957, an attorney or a businessman could take a 6:40 a.m. flight from Nashville to Washington, arriving at 11:40 a.m. A relatively short taxi drive would put him into his hotel, into an office, or a downtown business center by 12 or 12:30 p.m. This passenger could transact business in Washington and take any one of four flights back to Nashville, leaving Washington after a day's work between 6:55 p.m. and 9:10 p.m., either of which would arrive in Nashville in the early evening hours.

The early morning flight out of Nashville was a heavily patronized flight. I speak from experience. Many a time I have boarded this flight to find my friend, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] aboard, likewise enjoying the service which was then available. It was a popular flight from Oklahoma.

Today, unless one wishes to leave Nashville at 3:05 a.m. on a flight that arrives at Dulles airport at 5:36 a.m., the first available flight to Washington does not arrive until 1:25 p.m. This means, in nearly all cases, that 2 days rather than 1 are required for the transaction of business in the Nation's Capital by businessmen, attorneys, and public officials who wish to come to the Nation's Capital for public or private business.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the number of scheduled flights per week to and from Nashville's ten top-ranked origin and destination markets.

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

TABLE 2.—*Scheduled flights per week, Nashville, Tenn.*

Origin and destination	Sept. 1, 1957	Feb. 1, 1965
Nashville to New York	xx	45
New York to Nashville	xx	52
Nashville to Atlanta	xx	55
Atlanta to Nashville	xx	48
Nashville to Memphis	xx	67
Memphis to Nashville	xx	61
Nashville to Chicago	xx	20
Chicago to Nashville	xx	20
Nashville to Knoxville	xx	34
Knoxville to Nashville	xx	34
Nashville to Washington, D.C.	xx	41
Washington, D.C., to Nashville	xx	47
Nashville to Louisville	xx	48
Louisville to Nashville	xx	41
Nashville to Chattanooga	xx	28
Chattanooga to Nashville	xx	21
Nashville to St. Louis	27	28
St Louis to Nashville	20	21
Nashville to Cincinnati	34	34
Cincinnati to Nashville	34	27
Total	1,110	772

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator was good enough to mention my name in the co-use of flights through Nashville. It is a gateway from Oklahoma to Washington and New York on one of the major airlines.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee is rendering a great service to all cities like Nashville, Oklahoma City, Tulsa, Chattanooga, Memphis, and countless other cities, including Dayton, Cincinnati, and Cleveland in Ohio, and Indianapolis, Ind.—I could mention dozens of others—who are suffering from lack of jet transportation.

In other words, much of the service we once knew with the good old reliable DC–6's and the Constellations, which would take a passenger from here to there, is no longer available as a convenience to travelers.

As the Senator from Tennessee has so ably pointed out, we can get on a plane at 5 o'clock in the morning, but we cannot get to Washington before noon to save our lives. My experience in going through Nashville has become less and less attractive because of the morning flight we once knew, which put us off in Washington about noon from Oklahoma City. The evening flight resembles the New York subway during rush hour because of the crowded conditions on the plane. This not only affects persons who travel for pleasure but also—because it is an Electra flight with only a small number of tourist seats being allocated—makes it impossible to get a tourist seat even 3 weeks ahead of plane departure time. That is how bad it is. I have tried it. I like to ride tourist when I can because in that way I can go back and forth more times between Washington and Oklahoma City for the same amount of money.

Reserving a tourist seat 3 weeks ahead is much too late for tourist accommodations on flights which go through Nashville.

Therefore, not only have the flights been diminished, but they have also made it impossible to fly tourist even though the airline advertises tourist accommodations. The Senator from Tennessee is doing the whole Nation a valuable service in inviting attention to the inadequacies of the service to certain intermediate points.

Had the railroads attempted to do this, there would have been a howl of frustration from Washington which would have been heard all the way to Wall Street, the seat of power of the railroad companies, as an avoidance of the service they had pledged to give the public.

The multimillion dollar airports near the cities which accommodate jet flights have actually resulted in fewer rather than more flights. The land around the multimillion dollar airports is constantly being improved at the expense of the taxpayers, furnishing many of the airports with landing fields for the scheduled airlines to use.

I wish to associate myself with what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], has said, and only regret that more Senators are not in the Chamber to hear his exposition which has been so carefully researched as to the actual reduction of flights in this day and age.

Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that it was his original complaint of several months ago, in colloquy with me, which led to a calling of the hearings which will soon be held by the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, to determine the reason for the inadequacy of service in such cities and towns as the Senator from Tennessee is detailing on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I invite him to be one of the opening witnesses, to testify to the inadequacy of service to certain cities, and tell what has happened to the service which could be maintained at convenient hours when once upon a time the Constellations and the DC–6's carried so much of the load of air travel.

I believe that the jets have proved to be a mixed blessing. They provide service on the hour and every hour from Washington to Los Angeles, but it is very difficult to get from New York to Washington, New York to Oklahoma City, Nashville or farther south.

It should be remembered that it was these cities that helped to bring these airlines to the point where they are now. The airlines are now forgetting that fact and are, instead, rushing in a frantic effort to see how much service they can wring out of the distant points. An airline's duty is one of service as well as moneymaking. I commend the Senator for bringing this point to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful for the comments of the distinguished

senior Senator from Oklahoma. I am encouraged that the subcommittee of which he is chairman will soon hold hearings on the subject. I suggest to him that his subcommittee consider the recommendation of legislation which would give to the Civil Aeronautics Board greater authority and responsibility with respect to the quality and quantity of service provided a city by a certificated carrier.

Railroads cannot abandon a city without the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. A certain airline, which I shall not name, has completely abandoned service to one of Tennessee's airports.

The statistics do not tell the full story, because the number of flights in and out, which I have listed, includes the local service flights, and does not reveal the full extent to which the major trunklines have diminished their service.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. The lack of clarity in the law giving the Civil Aeronautics Board the right to approve or disapprove airline schedules may have to be called into force if this trend toward inadequate service is not corrected. The Civil Aeronautics Board has never exercised power over scheduling. It exercises the right of allocating the route structure. I would presume that if an airline does not fly that route structure with adequate service, the CAB could deny it the right to fly that route. However, that would merely mean that the airline would overfly the community and leave it with inadequate service.

For that reason, the hearing will be quite important to determine whether additional powers should be given the Civil Aeronautics Board. If our trunk airlines cannot fly to intermediate points, and if they neglect passenger service there, while saturating the more or less lush markets with super service, something will have to be done about it.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I make no such suggestion and certainly do not wish to imply any threat, but I recall to the able Senator that when the electrical utilities failed to serve the people of the United States, Congress found it advisable to enact a law providing a program to promote rural electrification. When the [redacted] utilities were not vigorous in supplying adequate service, the Congress found it advisable to inaugurate a rural [redacted] program.

I should not like to see the airlines serving intermediate-sized cities allow service to deteriorate to the point that Congress would have to consider such action with respect to air service. I do not think that is advisable or that it will become necessary. However, the trend is clearly toward poorer service, instead of better service, to most American cities, notwithstanding the expenditure of large amounts of taxpayers money.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is quite interesting to note that as the airlines have become more profitable and the number of passenger miles flown has increased dramatically from year to year, the number of airlines, particularly trunklines, has decreased over the past few years. This has been the result of mergers and combinations. There would have been more of these if the Civil Aeronautics Board had not put its foot down and said, "Enough is enough." Although free competition is limited to a degree by the certificate of convenience and necessity, which is required to fly certain routes, I would remind the Senator that it takes only a piece of paper from the Civil Aeronautics Board to activate any number of routes. Many of the feeder lines, to which the Senator has referred, may at some time be in a position of seeking to be made junior trunklines, or perhaps even senior trunklines, if intermediate service is continued to be neglected by existing trunklines.

Mr. GORE. A little more competition might be helpful. It has proved to be helpful in many other instances during our history.

CHATTANOOGA

Chattanooga, Tennessee's third largest, is a progressive city in the southeastern section of the State. Her 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets are New York, Atlanta, Nashville, Chicago, Washington, Memphis, Charlotte, Miami, Knoxville, and Philadelphia.

The number of scheduled flights per week at Chattanooga to and from the above 10 cities declined from 652 in 1957 to 437 in February 1965.

Chattanooga has slightly more-frequent service in February of this year to and from Memphis and from Chicago. In all other respects, insofar as the ten cities are concerned, there was less-frequent service.

In 1957 there were 28 flights per week from Chattanooga to Miami and 14 flights per week from Miami to Chattanooga. As of last month there was no direct service at all, either way. This abandonment of direct service to and from Miami has occurred despite the fact that the average number of daily passengers to and from Miami has increased by about 27 percent.

By what stretch of the imagination can this be called an improvement in service?

I do not allege that the carriers have any concerted plan to curtail the opportunity of Tennesseans to come to Washington and New York. But Chattanooga, too, has suffered a sharp decline in the number of available flights to and from each city.

There were only one-third as many flights per week from Chattanooga to Nashville last month as there were in 1957. If the major trunk carriers are defending their less frequent schedules between nearby cities with the argument that local service carriers are providing this service, here is one example in which that argument is not convincing.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the number of scheduled flights per week to and from Chattanooga's 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets.

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

TABLE 3.—*Scheduled flights per week, Chattanooga, Tenn.*

Origin and destination	Sept. 1, 1957	Feb. 1, 1965
Chattanooga to New York	35	19
New York to Chattanooga	35	26
Chattanooga to Atlanta	55	69
Atlanta to Chattanooga	62	56
Chattanooga to Nashville	61	21
Nashville to Chattanooga	47	28
Chattanooga to Chicago	54	21
Chicago to Chattanooga	33	35
Chattanooga to Memphis	21	26
Memphis to Chattanooga	21	26
Chattanooga to Washington, D.C.	28	19
Washington, D.C., to Chattanooga	28	12
Chattanooga to Charlotte	20	14
Charlotte to Chattanooga	20	7
Chattanooga to Miami	28	0
Miami to Chattanooga	14	0
Chattanooga to Knoxville	41	32
Knoxville to Chattanooga	49	26
Chattanooga to Philadelphia	0	0
Philadelphia to Chattanooga	0	0
Total	652	437

KNOXVILLE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Knoxville is Tennessee's fourth largest city. It is the home of the University of Tennessee and, in addition, serves as the airport for the vital atomic energy complex at nearby Oak Ridge and the Alcoa industrial complex.

Knoxville's 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets are Nashville, New York, Atlanta, Washington, Chicago, Memphis, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Birmingham. Scheduled flights per week to and from these cities declined from 660 in 1957 to 583 in February 1965.

Service from Knoxville to New York declined from 56 flights per week to 33 per week. Return flights dropped from 49 to 26 per week. Service to and from Washington also declined, although not quite so sharply.

There has been no substantial increase in service to any of the cities to which most people in and around Knoxville want to go, except to Memphis.

Although the number of passengers arriving at and departing from the Knoxville airport has continued to increase over the years, they have fewer choices as to times of departure and arrival. I do not equate this situation with progress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the number of scheduled flights a week to and from Knoxville's 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets.

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

TABLE 4.—*Scheduled flights per week, Knoxville, Tenn.*

Origin and destination	Sept. 1, 1957	Feb. 1, 1965
Knoxville to Nashville	28	34
Nashville to Knoxville	35	34
Knoxville to New York	56	33
New York to Knoxville	49	26
Knoxville to Atlanta	49	49
Atlanta to Knoxville	27	28
Knoxville to Washington, D.C.	69	54

TABLE 4.—*Scheduled flights per week, Knoxville, Tenn.*—Continued

Origin and destination	Sept. 1, 1957	Feb. 1, 1965
Washington, D.C., to Knoxville	62	42
Knoxville to Chicago	27	21
Chicago to Knoxville	28	28
Knoxville to Memphis	35	47
Memphis to Knoxville	42	59
Knoxville to Cincinnati	34	21
Cincinnati to Knoxville	42	42
Knoxville to Pittsburgh	14	13
Pittsburgh to Knoxville	21	13
Knoxville to Philadelphia	14	20
Philadelphia to Knoxville	0	7
Knoxville to Birmingham	14	6
Birmingham to Knoxville	14	6
Total	660	583

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if this analysis had been confined to the trunk carriers, the decline in service, as measured by the number of available flights would have, statistically, been much more marked. I have included the flights by local service carriers in this analysis in order to present the total number of scheduled flights as fairly as it can be pictured without in any way seeking to emphasize the extremes.

Local service carriers have an important role to play in the provision of overall service. By and large they are doing a good job. So, for that matter, are the trunk carriers. But in my view, the trunk carriers, as, perhaps, the inevitable consequence of the rush to jets, are leaving a gap in service which the local service carriers are not equipped or designed to serve.

As I indicated earlier in these remarks, service between major metropolitan cities, provided by trunk carriers, is more frequent and faster than it was in prior years. With the development of the local service carriers, service between intermediate-sized cities which are relatively near each other has, with some exceptions, also improved. The local carriers have also brought service to many smaller communities which otherwise would have no service. But the service available to intermediate-sized cities to and from the larger metropolitan areas, to which many people wish to travel, and to and from each other, is declining rather than improving.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am in agreement with the distinguished Senator on the lack of service being extended, or the apparent lack of eagerness to extend service. In all fairness to the trunklines, however, I should like to add that this situation may be on the way to correction with the delivery of the intermediate type jet aircraft. As the distinguished Senator realizes, the 707's and the DC–8's had extremely long cruising ranges, and therefore they were better equipped to serve the long haul rather than the short haul or the intermediate traffic, the up and down traffic, the traffic with a stage length, for example, between Tulsa, Oklahoma, and Nashville.

With the coming of the new equipment—the Boeing 727 and the fabulous new Douglas DC–9—with adequate orders being placed by the trunklines, the equipment situation may provide some hope. I have been promised better service from Oklahoma City. That service will be improved with a 727 jet flight from Washington, D.C., to Oklahoma City and from Oklahoma City to Washington. That service may be expanded to other intermediate towns as delivery of these planes finally catches up with those of us who seem to be on the low end of the totem pole in the dispensing of airline service.

I know it will not come too soon, because we have waited a long time since the 1957 period when the adequacy of the service seemed to come to a somewhat abrupt end with the inauguration of the long-legged jets, which overflew us. I hope with the delivery of this new equipment, making possible more economics service to those intermediate points, we shall no longer be plagued with the inadequate service of which the Senator so eloquently speaks.

Mr. GORE. It sounded very good to me when I heard it for the first time about 5 years ago, but as I have watched the service deteriorate, not only year after year but month by month, my patience in waiting for the new equipment has become a little strained. I dare say that there is much merit in the views which the Senator from Oklahoma has expressed. I hope that with delivery of new equipment, designed particularly to provide better service to the intermediate-sized cities—and that constitutes most of the cities in the country, for there are not many cities like New York or Los Angeles—we will soon have available a service which will reveal this improvement. I have waited long and now wait impatiently for it, but in view of the Senator's statement, I shall wait hopefully yet.

I realize that our trunk carriers operate on the profit motive, but so do the electric utilities; so do the railroads; so do the [redacted] companies.

Airline service has been brought into being and made feasible by vast expenditures of the taxpayers' money. The Civil Aeronautics Board must have the necessary authority. And unless it has the will to exercise its responsibility as a regulatory agency, the Congress had better bestir itself both with respect to the CAB and with respect to the authority which it has or does not have or is willing or unwilling to exercise.

I do not advocate that airlines should be required to operate expensive planes nearly empty at great loss merely to serve the convenience of a few individuals. What gives me concern is the overall direction of the industry. I seriously question whether policies now followed by the airlines and by Government best serve the public interest, or, in the long run, the best interests of the carriers themselves. In the final analysis, any private industry must provide a product or a service that meets a public demand.

In my opinion, the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate should, as a matter of priority, conduct an exhaustive survey of the air service currently available to the American people. I suggest that particular attention be paid to the needs, and the degree to which these needs are being met, of the great mass of our citizens who do not live in the very large cities—and of those who do live in those cities but desire to travel to one not so large.

The taxpayers have invested much money in the development of airline service. I do not begrudge a penny of it. But if we are to continue to invest, such as in the development of the SST, we ought to be sure that the result will be more, as well as faster and safer, service to the American people.

The role of the CAB and the FAA should be thoroughly analyzed. Perhaps some of the ground rules need to be changed.

At present, a municipality which requires more frequent, or additional, service is pretty much at the mercy of the carrier or carriers who have "certificates" to provide service to and from a given point or points. It sometimes seems to me that these certificates are heavy on the side of authority and light on the side of responsibility to provide service. Generally, there is little that can be effectively done by a community when service is decreased by a certificated carrier.

The CAB has an enormous and a complex task if it properly fulfills its responsibility to the public. This is true of any regulatory agency. It must constantly guard against the tendency of regulatory agencies to assume the point of view of the industry it is supposed to regulate.

I call this particularly to the attention of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma. There is a great tendency on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Board and its personnel, like the chameleon, to look more and more like the limb on which it perches.

I observe in passing that within days after I had requested certain statistical information from the CAB to prepare this address, the fact that I was interesting myself in this matter became known to some of the major carriers. Calls to my office sought to elicit just what I had in mind. I made and make no secret of it. It is perhaps a coincidence that since I requested this information, two trunk airlines have advised my office of additions or improvements in service contemplated by them with respect to service to Tennessee.

I welcome this promised improvement.

I do not minimize the problems of the carriers in their efforts to obtain for their stockholders a reasonable return on their investment. But the fact remains that in important respects there is less service available to the American people than there was several years ago, despite our claims to continued progress.

Bigger and faster planes serve a useful purpose. But I seriously question whether our rush, pellmell, into the jet age is fully or adequately serving the interest of the traveling public.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I compliment the Senator on his thorough research and

his thought-provoking challenge to the trunklines to serve the cities that furnished the traffic that built the trunklines from their fledgling start to the position of power they now occupy. I recall an old Chinese proverb:

When you drink the water, do not forget the spring from which it flowed.

The wealth, power, and prestige of our airlines originated in the traffic from Nashville, Chattanooga, and Memphis, from cities like Tulsa and Oklahoma City, from Wichita, Kans., Des Moines, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr., cities which now are neglected. Instead the air carriers rush to fly from coast to coast the largest number of plush flights.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for calling attention to this deficit in what otherwise would be a rather outstanding picture of air traffic.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. Since he invited me to testify, I wish to avail myself of the opportunity. Has the Senator in mind any date when hearings will commence?

Mr. MONRONEY. Probably some time in May. The Easter recess is approaching, and it is difficult to make plans ahead of that time.

Mr. GORE. I shall look forward to an appearance before the Senator's committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. If I guess correctly, we shall probably have a majority of the Members of the Senate complaining about the inadequacy of service to communities and towns of their States, as the Senator has mentioned in the case of Tennessee. I only hope that others who speak will document their cases as well as the Senator from Tennessee has done this afternoon on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

FULL EMPLOYMENT—A REQUIREMENT OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I should like to discuss this afternoon the next step down the long, long road to the Great Society: attainment of a full employment economy.

This year, the Nation will climb toward still higher levels of affluence. Our gross national product is expected to reach $660 billion. During the last 48 months it has increased by more than a fourth. So has the amount of money in the pocket of the average consumer for spending on other than the necessities of life. Industrial production is up by a third over what it was 4 years ago and industrial profits are half again what they were in 1961.

If we are able to maintain this pace of expansion—and we have the economic know-how to do so, if we wish—the United States will achieve a gross national product sometime within the next 10 years of $1 trillion.

This is the measure, in our affluent society, of the abundance which now lies within our grasp.

We have entered a new stage in the development of human society—a stage of which abundance, not scarcity, is the hallmark. We have broken the shackles of mere subsistence and survival for a majority of our citizenry. And now, in the words of Walt Rostow in his little book "The Stages of Economic Growth," we have the promise of "seeing what men can and will do when the burden of scarcity is lifted from them."

The President has sensed this promise in framing the political challenge of the Great Society.

In making the transition from a subsistence to a mass consumption economy, however, we have left many problems unsolved. While our technology and productive potential have surged forward, many individuals, policies, and institutions have been left behind. Such institutions as Congress, for example, operate much as they did in the days of candlelight, the stagecoach, and the China Clipper.

While the great economic successes of the tax cut of 1964 have shattered many of the old cliches which until recently hamstrung national economic policy, some, more appropriate to the days of Adam Smith than our own, still prevail.

Many families and communities which are caught up in the difficulties of transition are paying an unfair price for general progress. Despite our record levels of expansion over the last 4 years, for instance, nearly 4 million Americans are looking for work and are unable to find it, while millions of jobs go unfilled for lack of qualified applicants.

Although we are the richest Nation in the world by far, we are plagued with an unemployment rate higher than all but one or two of the more advanced industrial nations.

This does not make sense. Unused manpower means lower levels of consumption. Lower levels of consumption mean unused productive potential. Last year, despite one of the best rates of economic growth in our peacetime history, the Council of Economic Advisers estimated a gap of $25 to $30 billion between the Nation's potential output and its actual output because of unemployment and an inadequate rate of growth.

Why are we still plagued with joblessness, despite our recent reasonably rapid rates of expansion?

First, of all, because even these rates are not high enough to absorb the flood of war babies now pouring onto the labor market—and this flood will continue until 1980. Our labor force currently numbers 76 million. By 1970 it will rise to 86 million and by 1980 it will be up to 101 million.

The people who comprise this labor force are now alive, so we know actually, not merely by prognosis or educated guess, how big the labor force will be.

Another disturbing factor is that half of all those who will have entered the work force by 1970 will be under 25 years of age.

Half of all those who will have entered the work force by 1970 will be under 25, and it is this age group which is experiencing the greatest difficulties in finding work. Its unemployment rate is twice that of the rest of the work force.

We need a rate of expansion high enough therefore, to absorb this horde of young people.

It must also be high enough to absorb those displaced by advancing technology, changing markets, and industrial obsolescence. Much of the blame for our failure to achieve full employment in recent years has been laid to that grossly misunderstood phenomenon, "automation." Far more than automation is involved, but there can be little doubt that technological change has taken its toll in certain occupations.

One general way to measure the impact of advancing technology is to look at the increase in goods and services each American worker is able to produce in a year compared with past years—a statistic couched in terms of increased output per man-hour or sometimes referred to as the "productivity increase."

The average annual productivity increase for 1909 to 1947 was 2 percent. That is, each year, American workers produced 2 percent more than they did the previous year with the same amount of work.

If the labor force had remained stable—which, of course, it did not—the gross national product would have risen 2 percent, or, in the alternative, would have remained the same, and 2 percent of the labor force would have become unemployed.

The 1947–62 average annual productivity increase was 3 percent. The 1958–63 average was 3.1 percent. The average rate of increase for the past 4 years, however, has risen to 3.6 percent.

An increase of 2 to 3 percent and perhaps 3½ percent in the rate of output per man-hour is more dramatic than it initially appears. Since it means that it takes fewer workers each year to produce the same amount of gross national product, obviously the gross national product must grow enough each year to make certain that no one is thrown out of a job because of increases in output per man-hour made possible by improved technology. As an example, if we assume for a moment that our labor force is not growing and that it totals 75 million persons, an annual productivity increase of only 2 percent would mean that it would take 1.5 million fewer workers to produce the same gross national product as it did the previous year. In other words, the gross national product would have to grow enough to generate 1.5 million new jobs in order to prevent unemployment.

With productivity rising at a rate of 3 percent annually, we would need 2.25 million new jobs. If the 3½ percent rate of the last 4 years should prove to be a new longrun trend, 2.6 million jobs per year must be created to keep unemployment from rising.

Now we must add to that figure the additional new jobs needed to absorb all those new young workers from the "war babies" generation who are now joining the labor force. If we take both increases in productivity and the growth in the size of the labor force we can expect for the remainder of this decade into account, the economy must generate an average of 3½ million new jobs a year through the rest of the decade just to keep unemployment from rising beyond its persistent recent level of 5 percent of the work force. An additional 2 to 3½ million jobs would be needed to

reduce unemployment to 4 percent of the labor force and another three-fourths of a million to reach 3 percent, which, in my opinion, is what we must define as reasonable full employment. This includes an allowance for workers who reenter the labor force as job opportunities increase. The rate of economic growth necessary to create enough jobs to hold unemployment at present levels exceeds 4 percent. In order to reduce unemployment to 3 percent by 1968, the economy would have to expand at nearly 5½ percent per year in constant dollars plus additional growth in money terms to offset any increases in the price level.

In the President's manpower report for 1965, the Secretary of Labor arrived at a similar conclusion. He wrote:

Taking into consideration the need to create jobs to reduce the unemployment rate from the current level of 5 percent to a more acceptable level it will be necessary to sustain an annual average rate of increase in gross national product about equal to this year's high rate of growth for the next half-dozen years. It is obvious that an aggressive policy of action to stimulate output and employment growth will be necessary if even the present high rate of unemployment is not to rise further.

The Joint Economic Committee in its comments on the President's Economic Report last week expressed concern that the recommended cuts in excise taxes plus increases in social security benefits and any economic impetus from the 1966 Federal budget will not be enough to prevent the unemployment rate from rising toward the end of the year. The committee points out that the present $100 billion budget will result in a sharp increase in the full employment budget surplus early next year and that this may act to brake our present expansion and force the rate of unemployment up.

The President seems aware of this danger and in his Economic Report he states that, if employment conditions should warrant, he may come back to Congress later in the year to ask for additional tax and monetary authority to cope with any slackening in the rate of growth. He also has asked Congress to improve its own part in this process by providing means for acting rapidly on any such recommendations.

We should grant the President's request. Indeed, I would personally support discretionary authority to the President to vary tax rates up or down 5 percent in order to cope with the rise and fall in the business cycle.

But if our commitment to full employment as a goal is to be taken seriously—and it must in any program to build a Great Society—it is not enough for us to say that if signs of a downturn show up we will take action; by that time it may be too late. We must, through a proper coordination of public and private policy, prevent a downturn from even occurring.

And it is my opinion that we have not made full use of the Employment Act of 1946 to that end. Apparently, the Joint Economic Committee agrees. Last week the committee commented:

The act specifies that the President include in his report a program "for carrying out the policy declared (in the act) together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable" * * * We can understand the difficulties of presenting early in the Congress a completely rounded legislative program, but the requirement for the prompt development of national policy each year makes the submission of such a program imperative * * * The Employment Act also calls on the President, in his economic report, to set forth not only current levels of employment, production, and purchasing power, but also "such levels needed to carry out the policy declared in the act." * * * It would have been helpful if the Council of Economic Advisors had published in its report a specific dollar figure for its forecast of potential gross national product in 1965, and for the likely gap between this figure and its forecast of actual gross national product."

It may well be that the directives in the Employment Act of 1946 are adequate and that only our administration of the act needs to be strengthened. I agree with the majority members of the Joint Economic Committee, however, that now, as the 20th anniversary of this historic statute approaches, we should review its provisions to see if they need updating in the face of new economic knowledge and techniques which can help us achieve full employment.

To further facilitate this review, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Employment Act of 1946 and ask that it remain on the desk for 2 weeks for additional cosponsors.

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

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be inserted the full text of the bill together with a section-by-section analysis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will remain at the desk as requested, and the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1630) to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability

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 "Employment Act Amendments of 1965".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is and has been the policy of the United States, set forth in the Employment Act of 1946, to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power and to create and maintain conditions in the national economy under which useful employment opportunities will be afforded to all those who are able, willing, and seeking to work.

The period following the declaration of this policy has been one of profound economic and technological change. These changes have taken place at a time when the rate of economic growth has been substantially less than that necessary to absorb the combined pressures of rapid labor force growth and labor displacement caused by technological change.

These factors, in combination, have tended to impair the development of the maximum employment polices set forth in the Employment Act of 1946, have contributed to the rate of unemployment and underemployment, have limited the Nation's ability to meet its domestic and international commitments, have increased pressures on an already inadequate educational system, have retarded economic opportunity for millions of our citizens and have spawned conditions of deprivation which foster delinquency, crime, racial discrimination, and poverty.

It is accordingly declared that in order to attain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power as set forth under the Employment Act of 1946, specific goals and objectives for the attainment of these policies must be established.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for all who are able, willing, and seeking to work, and to establish a manpower utilization policy designed to promote maximum employment and to reduce unemployment to its lowest acceptable levels, and to promote, as a necessary concomitant thereto, an economic policy designed to develop and maintain rapid economic growth and reasonable price stability."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 20 of each year an economic report (hereinafter called the Economic Report) containing the following information:

"'(1) an analysis of the economic and employment conditions in the United States, setting forth: (i) the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power obtaining in the United States and such levels needed to carry out the policy declared in section 2 of this Act; (ii) current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power; (iii) a review of the economic program of the Federal Government and a review of economic conditions affecting employment in the United States or any considerable portion thereof during the preceding year and of their effect upon employment, production, and purchasing power; and (iv) a program for carrying out the

policy declared in section 2 of this Act, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable;

"'(2) a national employment and production budget, setting forth: (i) short-range and long-range projections of the size of the labor force; (ii) short-range and long-range projections of the levels of gross national product, Federal, State, and local government expenditures and total employment reasonably anticipated under foreseeable private actions and existing public policies; (iii) short-range and long-range goals or objectives for maximum employment, specifying the amount of total absolute employment required to achieve maximum employment; (iv) short-range and long-range goals or objectives for maximum production, specifying the amount of gross national product representing maximum production; (v) short-range and long-range goals or objectives for attaining maximum purchasing power; and (vi) the extent to which one or more of the basic objectives of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power should be modified in order to maintain the policy of reasonable price stability whenever the President finds that any of these objectives are in conflict with such policy, including the measures which, in the opinion of the President, should be taken in order to reconcile the policy of reasonable price stability with the goals or programs for attaining maximum employment, production, and purchasing power; and

"'(3) a full employment Federal budget, setting forth: (i) the estimated gross national product which will be required to attain the maximum employment and production objectives established under paragraph 2 (iii) and (iv) hereof; (ii) a summary of those portions of the national employment and production budget required under paragraph (2) (ii) hereof setting forth the gross national product expected under foreseeable private actions and existing public policies; (iii) a program of such Government expenditures and other measures, fiscal and monetary, as he may deem necessary to attain the maximum employment, production, and purchasing power objectives established under paragraph (2) (iii), (iv), and (v) hereof, which program shall include a short-range and long-range proposal for outlays designed to contribute to economic growth and the general welfare which may include but shall not be limited to conservation, development, and reclamation of natural resources, improved transportation systems, urban renewal, public housing, education, agricultural assistance, health, environmental improvements, and public welfare; and (iv) a review of the achievements of the immediate past short-range and long-range full employment Federal budget including the degree to which maximum employment, production, and purchasing power objectives were achieved and the reasons for any failure to achieve objectives previously established.'"

SEC. 5. Subsection (b)(3) of section 5 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the Economic Report, not later than March 1 of each year, to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives and with each appropriate standing committee thereof, containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report, including the sections covering the national employment and production budget and the full employment Federal budget, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and the House of Representatives and to each appropriate standing committee thereof as it deems advisable."

SEC. 6. Such Act is further amended by adding the following new sections:

"HEARINGS AND REPORTS BY THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"SEC. 6. (a) The Senate and House Appropriations Committees shall each in full committee hold hearings and consider in its entirety the full employment Federal budget and shall report to their respective Houses of Congress as to their findings and recommendations. Among the witnesses to be called at such hearings shall be the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee.

"(b) The standing committees of both Houses of Congress, when holding hearings on legislation substantially affecting the policies of this Act or the realization of its objectives of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power shall hear as witnesses on that legislation the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee. Reports pertaining to such legislation shall contain a statement of the Joint Economic Committee's position upon that legislation and the views of the standing committee with respect thereto.

"PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

"SEC. 7. (a) In order that the people of the United States, through their representative leadership may participate effectively in the development of private and public economic policies directed toward maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, there is hereby established a National Economic Advisory Council (hereinafter referred to as the 'Advisory Council') which shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Council of Economic Advisers and shall, among other duties, review annually and publish its recommendations on the national employment and production budget and the full employment budget.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall consist of twenty members to be appointed by the President from among representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumer, and public interest groups, and State and local governments. Members of the Advisory Council shall serve for terms of two years, except that members appointed to fill vacancies caused by death or resignation shall be appointed for the unexpired terms of their predecessors. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Advisory Council.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Council shall be entitled, while attending meetings of the Advisory Council, to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the President, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(d) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers shall furnish the Advisory Council with such personnel, facilities, and services as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"IMPROVEMENT FOR BUDGETARY PRACTICE

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of describing to the Congress in more meaningful terms the impact of the Federal budget upon the economy and to enable the Congress to distinguish more effectively between the various types of expenditures, the President shall in the annual budget message—

"(1) present a full and detailed account of the flow of cash payments between the public and the Federal Government and shall specifically indicate the amount of the estimated cash surplus, or estimated cash deficit, as the case may be; and

"(2) separate operating expenditures from investment-type expenditures which add to the wealth and prosperity of the country using such definitions and such detail as he shall deem appropriate.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 9. As used in this Act:

"(1) The term 'short range' means each fiscal year beginning July 1 following the submission of the Economic Report to the Congress and the term 'long range' means the next succeeding five fiscal years beginning July 1 following the submission of the Economic Report to the Congress.

"(2) For the period ending June 30, 1968, the term 'maximum employment' means a level of unemployment in the civilian labor force not to exceed 4 per centum of the labor force. Thereafter, the term 'maximum employment' shall mean a level of unemployment no greater than 3 per centum of the civilian labor force.

"(3) 'Maximum production' means that amount of production resulting from maximum employment, commensurate with freedom of choice between employment and leisure, and maximum productivity under conditions reflecting optimum utilization of scientific knowledge, technological improvements, labor force, and managerial ability.

"(4) 'Maximum purchasing power' means that amount of purchasing power necessary to maintain maximum employment and production, to make possible adequate economic growth and to assure a minimum adequate personal and family budget to all groups in American society without generating that type of inflationary pressure which results from purchasing power markedly in excess of maximum productive capacities."

SEC. 7. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), this Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

(b) The provisions of sections 4, 5, and 6 shall become effective January 1, 1966, and shall be applicable to the Economic Report transmitted on January 20, 1967, and each succeeding year thereafter.

(c) The provisions of section 8 shall be effective with respect to the annual budget message for the fiscal year 1967 and each subsequent budget message.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS: "EMPLOYMENT ACT AMENDMENTS XXXXXXX"

Section 1 gives the short title of the bill as "Employment Act Amendments of 1965."

Section 2 reaffirms the national commitment to maximum employment, production, and purchasing power as national goals. Declares that the Congress has found that those goals have not been attained since enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 because of rapid growth in the labor force and profound economic and technological change. Calls for specific economic and employment goals to be established.

Section 3 amends section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 to declare that it is the intent of Congress that the Federal Government, in close consultation with representatives from all major segments of the economy, coordinate its plans, functions, and resources to provide maximum employment, purchasing power, and economic growth.

Section 4: (1) Requires the President to send to Congress not later than January 20 of each year an "Economic Report" containing an analysis of current economic and employment conditions, projections of major trends in employment, production, and purchasing power, a review of the Federal programs affecting these trends, and a program designed to carry out the commitments contained in the next section.

(2) Requires the President to submit with the economic report a "full employment and

production budget" providing short- and long-range projections of labor force growth, gross national product, governmental expenditures at all levels and employment projected upon foreseeable public and private actions. This budget shall include short- and long-range goals for maximum employment, production, and purchasing power and shall state the extent to which they may have to be modified in order to preserve reasonable price stability.

(3) Requires the President to submit a "full employment Federal budget" setting forth the gross national product needed to attain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power in the following fiscal year, including a short- and long-range capital budget for expenditures in such employment generating fields as resource conservation and development, transportation, community development, education, agriculture, health, welfare, and environmental improvements.

Section 5 requires the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress to file with both Houses not later than March 1 of each year its findings and recommendations with respect to the Economic Report, including those sections dealing with the full employment and production budget.

Section 6 requires the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses to hold hearings on the full employment and production budget, including as witnesses, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Section 7 establishes a National Economic Advisory Council which shall be consulted by the Council of Economic Advisers in the preparation of the full employment and production budget and the entire Economic Report. The 20 members of the Council shall be drawn from industry, labor, agriculture, consumer and public interest groups and State and local government. Members will serve for 2 years and one shall be designated by the President as Chairman. They shall receive no salary but shall receive $75 per diem and travel expenses while attending the sessions of the Council.

Section 8 requires the President, in order to more fully inform Congress concerning the impact of the full employment Federal budget upon the economy, to distinguish between various types of expenditures by describing fully the flow of cash payments as well as the cash deficit or surplus and by distinguishing between operating expenditures and investment-type expenditures.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope that the Joint Economic Committee will study this bill in connection with its review of the Employment Act. As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I also intend to schedule hearings on it. I hope that out of these deliberations by the two committees the outlines of a more comprehensive and effective national policy for full employment will emerge.

Under this amendment to the Employment Act—which incidentally derives directly from the original intentions of the authors of the Employment Act—the President could provide us with rough targets in employment and investment needed to efficiently utilize our manpower and productive resources.

If a level of unemployment no higher than 3 percent were to be attained by 1968, for example, the President, under this amendment, would estimate that we will need a gross national product of $734 billion in 1963 dollars. To achieve that GNP his calculations would find that we must put an additional $5 billion into the pockets of consumers each year from now until 1968, or public purchases of goods and services must increase by a like amount, or there must be a combination of the two.

I agree, however, with the Joint Economic Committee that not all of the needed expansion in GNP can or should be provided in the private marketplace through tax cuts and monetary incentives. Because of the heavy financial burden this Nation has borne for 20 years in national defense, there is a gigantic legacy of unmet needs plaguing the Nation holding back whole regions, and thus the country as a whole, from meeting its full potential because of obsolescence. Some of these chronic needs will be met by the administration's new programs in the war on poverty, Appalachia, and economic development, and education. But a serious effort to meet them can cure both chronic obsolescence and chronic unemployment.

The door is open for a great expansion of educational, health, and other services to the Nation's disadvantaged people and to other far-reaching efforts to remove the scars from our society and reduce the obstacles which hamper its progress—

The Secretary of Labor commented in the President's manpower report.

The very success of the economy in achieving record levels of output, employment, and income has helped to overburden many public services—to the point where future economic growth will be adversely affected unless these services are rapidly strengthened. Automobile purchases and use, for example, have outstripped the capacity of streets and highways. Gains in industrial output and population growth have placed severe strains on water and other natural resources and on police and fire protection services. And the prospect of continued rapid population growth adds another dimension of need for enlarged school, hospital, recreational, and other facilities.

It is in meeting such needs as these—most of them identified in the past as in the public sector of the economy—that much of our future employment potential lies. This is why the bill which I have introduced requires the President to catalog such needs in a capital budget and design a plan to fill them in his full employment budget.

The allocations to community development and housing, for example, have never been governed by considerations of how they might affect annual employment levels. Yet programs of this type, having a very high labor content per dollar spent, are an important part of the job-creating impetus which Federal expenditures can give.

Witnesses before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee estimated the urban renewal and housing labor content at from about $560 to $660 per $1,000 contract award. The Department of Labor estimates that each $1 million of contract awards in construction creates 115 man-years of work.

The field of community development—which includes housing, urban renewal, mass transit, highways, pollution control, the construction of other local public facilities, and community planning—represents one of the largest areas of unmet needs in the Nation. There are, at the present time, between 7 and 8 million substandard dwelling units in our urban areas. The crop of young people in the war babies generation is now reaching maturity and will soon be marrying and starting families. The demands for new and rehabilitated dwellings, therefore, will increase dramatically. In addition, the growing proportion of older citizens in the population calls for the construction of housing specially adapted to their needs. An additional need for more low rent or purchase housing units is evidenced by the number of families who are unwillingly doubled up for economic reasons.

There are an enormous number of obsolete commercial and industrial structures in our metropolitan areas. Continuous expansion of metropolitan regions will increasingly direct attention toward improving inadequate transportation facilities—whether bus, subway, or railroad commuter service—as well as stepped-up construction of roads, bridges, and tunnels to accommodate mushrooming auto traffic.

Additional investment in facilities to support metropolitan growth is essential: schools, colleges, hospitals, health centers, playgrounds, and recreation buildings, welfare institutions, sewer and water plants, and lines.

The sums which will be required just to keep up with population growth in urban areas are staggering. Reliable estimates indicate that an investment of between $500 and $700 billion, both private and public, will be necessary just to accommodate the increasing urban population over the next 20 years. If the elimination of existing blight and obsolescence is included, an average annual investment of between $120 and $125 billion in private and public funds will be required each year over the next two decades in order to preserve and restore the vitality of the metropolitan areas of the country. This compares to public and private expenditures of about $50 billion in 1961.

In the sparsely populated sections of the Nation urgent needs also exist. In one study cited before the subcommittee, the total Federal investment in resource development—watershed conservation, forest stand improvement, soil conservation, and recreational development—required over a 10-year period came to $4 billion, about twice the current rate of expenditures. Approximately 250,000 new jobs would be generated by an additional $2 billion allocated for this purpose over a decade.

Several years ago Resources for the Future, Inc., estimated that a backlog of needed work programs in forestry, soil and water conservation, parks, fish and wildlife: range revegetation, water pollution and sediment, and other similar investments would require an investment of nearly $20 billion.

This calculation did not include the heavy construction programs in water development with a backlog of authorized prospects nearly equal in size. Total requirements for withdrawal of water from lakes and streams in the United States in 1954 was 300 billion gallons daily, or only about 27 percent

of the total streamflow, withdrawals in 1980 would be about 559 billion gallons daily and in the year 2000, more than 888 billion gallons daily, or more than 80 percent of total streamflow.

Water programs up to 1980 total almost $55 billion for Federal programs and $173 billion for non-Federal programs.

Some of the programs for expansion of development of water facilities are based on urgent needs to overcome accumulated backlogs. For example, the Public Health Service estimates that to overcome the backlog in municipal sewage treatment facilities by 1971 would require expenditures of $600 million annually, or more than twice the present rate of expenditure.

There are many new areas affording opportunities for new employment and investment in the technological segments of the private sector, too. Properly directed, technological advance can create far more new employment opportunities than it destroys. It can do so if applied in whole new areas of human endeavor. In late 1963, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower heard from over 2 dozen representatives from the aerospace industries concerning the opportunities for new employment which could be created by conscious use of the new technology we have devised in the space and defense efforts. They were almost unanimous in their judgment, however, that it would take a conscious, directed effort by the Federal Government to induce the use of these new technologies into untried fields. They argued that the markets for these new potentials are too ambiguous at present to lure investors into them unless Government creates the special opportunities necessary to make such an undertaking profitable.

It was this testimony which prompted the subcommittee to recommend creation of the President's Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress which was subsequently approved by Congress and which will make its recommendations on these matters next January.

The subcommittee was able to xxxxxxxx numerous highly technological fields in which the enormous technological expertise gained in the defense and space efforts can be applied, such as worldwide detailed inspection and surveillance systems for policing arms control; communications, command, and control systems; new educational technology for the classroom; new aids for air traffic control; medical electronics; new energy sources; mass transportation, and oceanography.

We have a national obligation to bring the many lessons we have learned in defense-related enterprise to bear upon the continuing unmet public needs of our communities and our people—needs which the defense industries and their advanced technologies may be able to help meet in this century of technological revolution. Certainly we have seen in the last decade, in defense and in space, the most remarkable achievement of national goals undreamt of a decade ago. We have assembled, in recognition of new national goals in space, in communication, and in national security, expert teams of engineers, research men, men of industry, and production forces. By a massive infusion of human effort, these teams have put man into space and, hopefully, in the long-range future, first on to the moon and later on other planets. We have proved through these efforts that when, as a nation, we clearly define for ourselves a priority goal, a 20th century technology can span, in a matter of months or a few years, a human advance which might otherwise have taken decades for its achievement.

In my view the time is soon approaching when we must harness the kinds of energies and technical skills which have been created to meet national goals in defense and in space to improve the conditions of human life. There are vast unmet community and human needs in the United States. There are millions of Americans who wish simply to live in a safe and sanitary house which they can afford to rent or buy. Our technology can afford to help them do just that.

I have in mind the millions of Americans who would benefit from a mass urban and interurban transportation system—efficient, speedy, and inexpensive. I believe that the experts on propulsion who can put tons of instruments on the moon or send a man around the earth in 90 minutes, could get a commuter comfortably to his job and back to his home, 30 miles away, in one-half or one-quarter the commuting time presently endured by millions of working citizens.

I have in mind the millions of American children who are waiting for the benefits of 20th century technology to provide them with adequate schools, educational facilities, and teaching aids. I am confident that a communications system which can flash a television picture around the earth in an instant, can solve the communications tangle in our schools and provide a topnotch information and education service to millions of schoolchildren.

Can we harness the technology which has put us in space to meet these pressing human and community goals? What is the proper role of the Federal Government in providing the benefits of 20th century technology to a community's schools, its mass transportation system, its public works, its public and private housing, and its productive resources? These are some of the challenging questions for this economy of systematic invention. These are some of the questions with which the new Presidential Commission deal. The new jobs we need so desperately will not come from the application of sophisticated technology to traditional productive enterprise, but they will come from the application of technology to whole new lines of endeavor and unmet need.

Today, I speak only of those employment policies needed to create the new jobs we need for full employment. In another speech I shall discuss the manpower policies we need to make certain that the skills of our people meet the needs of the economy.

Today, I wish only to stress that our technological society has become so massive in its capabilities and its real problems so incredibly complex that we can not hope to utilize our full potential without some major departures in public and private policy. We will have to apply the same principles of the "systems" approach as we have in defense or space.

Such an undertaking implies that we shall have to engage in some of the long-range national planning and coordination which nearly all of the nations of Western Europe have adopted since the end of World War II. The essential defect in America's kit of economic programs is coordination.

There must be some direction, some coordination. Someone must set national objectives and performance levels. Someone must hitch present policy to future prospects. And in no field is this more true than in our attempt to bring our technological capabilities to bear on some of our chronic public needs. The bill I introduce today would move us toward that objective by requiring the President to define goals for us and devise programs to achieve those goals through intelligent use of the Federal budget.

Change is the only permanent part of the modern scene. In a static society anticipation and foresight are unnecessary. But when the daily lives of 200 million people are in constant flux; when their individual welfare is threatened by forces beyond their control; then planning and a definition of social objectives is essential. And only government can provide that perspective for the community as a whole.

John Dewey once wrote that a "culture which permits science to destroy its values without permitting science to create new ones is a culture destroying itself."

Now, in the early days of the Second Industrial Revolution, we have this opportunity to create those new political values which will carry us toward our objectives. This bill today attempts to define some of the issues implicit in such an undertaking.

We built this Nation to serve its people—

The President said in his 1965 state of the Union message.

We want to grow and build and create, but we want progress to be the servant and not the master of man.

We do not intend to live—in the midst of abundance—isolated from neighbors and nature, confined by blighted cities and bleak suburbs, stunted by a poverty of learning and an emptiness of leisure.

The Great Society asks not only how much, but how good; not only how to create wealth, but how to use it; not only how fast we are going, but where we are headed.

The most dangerous phenomenon in American life today is social and political lag, a lag between what the world requires and what our political institutions are willing to provide.

Our purpose must be to build a world in which technological innovation and efficiency are not ends in themselves. Our purpose is to blend them to the cause of human freedom, intellectual excellence, perfection of the community and full employment of our talents and skills.

The promise in the Employment Act of job opportunities for all those able and willing to work has not yet been ful-

filled, the President stated in his economic report.

The test of government of, by, and for the people is how well it responds to the challenge of providing a gainful role for every citizen. The bill I introduce today is designed to achieve that end.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed, an article entitled "Two Economic Reports: Canada and the United States," by Gerhard Colm of the National Planning Association; a column by J. A. Livingston, financial writer for the Philadelphia Bulletin entitled "Nation's Spirit Gets a New Uplift" which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 21; an article from Business Week of March 6 entitled "Changing Rules of Growth"; and an editorial from the March 1 Washington Post entitled "The Challenge of Growth."

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

[From the National Planning Association, February 1965]

TWO ECONOMIC REPORTS: CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

(By Gerhard Colm, NPA chief economist [1])

With the coming of the new year, the economic goals and prospects of Canada and of the United States were subject to a thoroughgoing review on both sides of the border. The comparison between the Annual Review published by the Economic Council of Canada under the title "Economic Goals for Canada to 1970" and the U.S. Economic Report of the President highlights both the differences and the similarities of the two varying approaches.

ECONOMIC GOALS FOR CANADA

The Economic Council of Canada has submitted its first Annual Review. Canadian statutes prescribe specifically that the council examine the prospects, "potentialities," and policies for medium- and long-term growth of the Canadian economy. This report represents the first Canadian attempt to provide the annual systematic and comprehensive look into the future prescribed by law. In 1956, a 25-year projection was published by an ad hoc royal commission (Gordon report), but it was only in 1963 that the legislature set up the council and gave it the duties, among others, of recommending national economic policies related to economic growth; studying the effects of technological change and automation on economic growth and employment; discussing with representatives from industry and other private groups "what specific plans for production and investment in major industries * * * will best contribute to a high and consistent rate of economic growth"; studying regional economic problems; and encouraging cooperation between labor and management in the promotion of economic growth.

The council consists of 28 members. Of this number, three are professional, full-time "directors," one of whom serves the council as chairman. The remaining 25 members (including eight members of the Private Planning Association of Canada) serve on a part-time basis; they are leading representatives of primary and manufacturing industries, commerce and finance, organized labor, and consumers and are drawn from all regions of Canada. A staff of specialists provides support work for the group.

The council projects a potential annual rate of growth in real output, i.e., measured in constant prices, of 5½ percent for the period to 1970. Such a rate would be considerably higher than that actually accomplished for 1956–62, although about the same as that for the period for 1949–56.

The 5½-percent rate of growth suggested in the report is a target—a calculation of the potential—and not a best-judgment forecast. That this is a target rate is perhaps emphasized by the increase it represents over the 3-percent rate of growth experienced since 1956. The review points to the acceleration of total labor force growth and, even more dramatic, to the increase in numbers of young workers, as pushing potential above that of postwar years. Productivity was depressed over the past 7 years for many and varied reasons (some of which were short term), and there are a number of factors—such as accelerating research and technology and an increasingly skilled labor force—which will be more favorable to productivity gains in the future.

Other goals beside economic growth are recognized by the council. Full employment, which is defined as no more than 3-percent unemployment, has a special meaning in an economy which in 1958–62 had an average of 6.7-percent unemployment, substantially higher than in other industrially advanced countries. The 3-percent rate is called a realistic objective for 1970 but is not considered an ultimate goal. Reasonable price stability is a second goal. A third goal is expressed in terms of the widest participation in economic growth with respect to both regions and economic groups. A viable balance of payments is also of particular concern because of the importance of external factors to the Canadian economy. In regard to the balance of payments and growth as goals, expansion of world trade, especially in primary commodities, and sustained economic growth of the United States are prerequisites. The difficulties of obtaining these goals is not underestimated and the possibility of conflict between the goals and their means of achievement is given serious consideration.

The projections are expected to be used as guides for government policies and as benchmarks for business managers and labor leaders. In addition to the aggregate growth rate, the council examines the expectation and prospects for consumer expenditures, public and private investment, international transactions, and government expenditures; a possible pattern of demand by these sectors which would be consistent with the "potential" total output is sketched for 1970. By setting forth the pattern, the council does not intend that its review be substituted for planning in government or the individual sectors, but urges that the review be used as a framework within which more specific analysis can be undertaken.

The council outlines in a very broad way the implications for policy in regard to expenditures, taxation, and other economic policies believed to be needed to realize the various goals. Government expenditures (all levels of government) are projected as increasing by 5 percent per year in constant prices. The largest rates of increase are in foreign aid, transportation, health (publicly sponsored health insurance is not assumed until after 1970), and education. Only a slight percentage rise is anticipated in defense and in defense-related expenditures; this is a fairly important factor in keeping the total government expansion at a moderate rate. The increase in government revenues—at present tax rates—is projected at a somewhat larger rate than the increase in expenditures. Therefore, a budget surplus would be expected if actual output reached its potential by 1970. Since the council desires a "combination of levels of tax rates and expenditure programs which would yield a rough balance if the economy were operating at potential output," a recommendation follows combining some future tax reduction with the increase in expenditures. The council also appeals for public and private efforts to enhance productive efficiency and increased competitiveness of Canadian industry, for responsible restraint in both wage demand and business pricing, and for private long-range planning of business investment outlays.

COMMON GROUND

In basic approach there is much in common between the Canadian Review and the U.S. Economic Report of the President.

Both reports use the concept of the production gap. Conventional business-cycle analysis and economic-stabilization policy were concerned with the periodic ups and downs in economic activity. Restraining the boom and mitigating recessions were the objectives. The trend—the average rate of growth—was expected to take care of itself. In recent years, the emphasis has shifted. The major concern is now with economic growth. This requires a new method of measuring the primary task of economic and fiscal policy. The answer was the construction of a curve depicting the economic potential and contrasting it with the actual development for the past and prospects for the future, assuming continuation of present economic and fiscal policy. The difference between the two curves is the production gap; the objective of policy is to narrow this gap.

Chart I, based on the Canadian Review (1964) and the U.S. Economic Report (1965), depicts the gap for the recent past. In both cases, the charts show the narrowing of the gap since the 1960–61 recession but also the short fall from potential that still remains.

For the next 5 years, the Canadian Review projects a potential rate of growth in real terms of 5½ percent per year. The U.S. Economic Report uses for recent decades a potential rate of growth of 3.5 percent, for the present a rate of 3¾ percent, and for the next 5-year period a rate of 4 percent per year, possibly somewhat more thereafter. The rate is rising because of increased additions to the labor force and more rapid productivity advances. To compare the Canadian 5½ percent potential rate of growth with the 4 percent for the United States, three points should be considered. First, the Canadian potential rate of growth is measured from an actual base year 1963 to a target year 1970. The U.S. rate is measured from the present potential to a potential in 1970. If the U.S. rate of growth were measured in the same way as the Canadian, it would not be 4 percent but 4.6 percent. Second, the Canadian concept of potential output assumes 3 percent unemployment, but for the United States reduction to 4 percent is assumed as an interim goal. Third, the expected relative increase in the labor force, high in both the United States and Canada in contrast with Western Europe, is still higher in Canada than in the United States (see chart II—chart not printed in the RECORD).

Both reports use the concept of the full employment budget and the theory of the so-called fiscal drag. The actual course of revenues, expenditures, and the resulting surplus or deficit is partly determined by (a) the conditions of the economy, as when relatively low income and high unemployment result in low tax revenues and high unemployment compensation payments, and (b) policy decisions to step up programs or reduce tax rates in order to activity influence the level of economic activities. In order to examine the influence of budget policies on the economy, fiscal changes can best be measured in terms of a full employment budget. In a full employment budget the revenues are estimated as if income and profits were at the level of full resource utilization (unemployment not more than 4 percent in the United States and 3 percent

[1] Assisted by Carol S. Carson.

in Canada), and the expenditures are similarly estimated.

Given full employment in recent years, the U.S. Federal budget would have consistently shown a surplus, although the actual course of events produced a deficit in most of these years. When coupled with the actual level of expenditures, these deficits were the result mainly of individual and corporate income being lower than their potential, thereby producing smaller tax revenues. Only last year did tax cuts substantially reduce the surplus on a full employment budget basis. These tax cuts are credited by the Economic Report with direct or indirect responsibility for the faster pace in economic activities and the narrowing of the production gap (see chart III—chart not printed in RECORD).

Both the U.S. Report and the Canadian Review assume that with economic growth full employment revenues have a tendency to increase faster than expenditures, thereby preventing income and profits left after taxes for consumption and investment from increasing as fast as the economic potential. This acts as a constant, built-in drag on the economy—the so-called fiscal drag. This theory leads both groups of advisers to recommend that in the course of economic growth it is possible and necessary to increase Government programs and to reduce tax rates in the same period.

DIFFERENCES IN EMPHASIS

The mandate for the Canadian Council requires emphasis on the intermediate- and long-term future. Other agencies of the Government and the central bank are concerned with the short-run prospects. The Employment Act of 1946, which established the U.S. Council of Economic Advisers, is vague on the timespan to be covered. The emphasis of the U.S. Economic Report, judging from the number of pages allocated, is still on the review of the past and the outlook for the immediate future. The U.S. Report gives a forecast for this year's GNP—$660 billion as the midpoint of a $10 billion range with only little promise of improvement in the rate of unemployment. The President's Economic Report does, however, look at the immediate problem in the perspective of the longer run future. The official report of the President, which largely has the purpose of urging early congressional action on administration proposals, naturally emphasizes the near-term outlook, while a nonpolitical advisory report of the type produced in Canada also naturally emphasizes the longer term outlook if for no other reason than in order to avoid the political controversies of the day. The Canadian Council justifies its emphasis, however, on a more basic premise. They say: "It is desirable to avoid excessive preoccupation with short-term cyclical behavior, and to attune policy more consistently to longer term views of basic economic conditions and trends, and to reduce uncertainties regarding general economic policies. * * * Steady economic growth is the best way to avoid recessions."

Nothing in the U.S. Economic Report would contradict this statement. Although a growth-supporting policy is the best way to reduce the probability of a recession, one can never be sure that it will be fully successful. Adoption of the best fire-prevention policy should not be an occasion for getting rid of the fire engines. The U.S. Report properly makes recommendations for readying policies to be used in case of a downturn. This has no counterpart in the Canadian Review. The U.S. Report also makes some interesting qualitative observations concerning the longer run prospects. It believes that the changing age structure of the American population will generate increasingly rising consumer demand and that technological development will induce increasing investments. Therefore, a strengthening of demand in the private sector is expected, lessening reliance on the contribution of fiscal policy in support of economic growth.

For the period to 1970, the Canadian Review not only posits the rate of potential growth, but depicts the 1970 target in quantitative estimates for consumption, investment, international transactions, and government budgets. Moreover, staff studies published under the auspices of the Canadian Economic Council give even greater detail on output and investment potentials. Such estimates are believed to be of greatest usefulness for business planning. The American counterpart presents no such estimates.

DIFFERENCES IN ORGANIZATION

The differences in the character of the reports result in part from the differences in the character of the Councils themselves.

In the United States, the Council is an advisory staff of the President. It is located in the Executive Office of the President and its three members are appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. The Economic Report is the President's report even though it is prepared with the assistance of the Council; its recommendations are the President's recommendations. The Council's own report only provides background analysis and fills in details. The Canadian Council is also set up by the federal government, but it is not part of the government machinery. Indeed, the three full-time members are given 7-year contracts purposely to remove them from politics. The Canadian Council thus must sell its report and recommendations to the Government on the basis of merit.

The Council in Canada includes, by statute, persons who are representative of all sectors and regions of the economy. In this first report, all members signed the report without dissent, so that all signers assume responsibility for the contents. By thus drawing all groups into the deliberation, it is hoped that the document will have greater force and appeal in influencing decisions in the private and public sectors.

The Canadian law provides for a scope of activity more similar to the French idea of planning than to that in the United States. The semi-independent organization of the Council in Canada, however, is quite unique. It is similar to some proposals debated in the United States during the deliberation of what became the Employment Act of 1946; namely, setting up a semi-independent economic council reporting to both the President and the Congress.

Might such a semi-independent, nonpolitical organization with membership drawn from all economic groups be more effective for the United States than the present setup? I believe not. First, under the American presidential system, the President should have full responsibility for the recommendations on economic and fiscal legislation submitted to the Congress and for the economic and fiscal policies of his administration. He needs advisers directly in his own office. This does not deny the usefulness of outside advice, but I doubt that the semipublic structure of the Canadian Council would be compatible with the presidential system in the United States. Second, I believe that the separation of advice on short-run prospects, on the one hand, and medium and long range, on the other hand, may lead to difficulties. The immediate policies should be nothing but a step in the direction of the longer run. Third, I am not sure that a report of the character of the Canadian document would find unanimous support by professional economists, business leaders, labor leaders, and others from both parties in the United States. Such a document would be of little use if all controversial material had to be removed in order to obtain unanimity. Fourth, the Employment Act of 1946 authorizes the U.S. Council to set up advisory committees of business, labor, consumers, and State and local governments. Advice of such groups has been obtained from time to time. However, more could be done than has been done thus far to make the representatives of the private sector partners in the process of policy formulation.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that the character of the U.S. Economic Report as an official presidential statement places certain restaints on it which are absent in the Canadian system. This explains why under the American system there is need for private organizations which represent business, labor, and professional groups to take leadership in providing planning guidelines until they become a generally accepted routine which can be taken over by government.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1965]

BUSINESS OUTLOOK: NATION'S SPIRIT GETS A NEW UPLIFT

(By J. A. Livingston)

President Johnson has done something for the young generation. He has aroused the sympathy of men for men, of the well-off and well-educated for the not-so-well-off and poorly educated. Beatnikism is yielding to the therapy of purpose.

There is no telling what the economic consequences will be. A ground-swell progress is possible.

The grand design of the Great Society did not begin with Johnson. John F. Kennedy captured the mood in the 1960 presidential campaign when he promised to get the country moving again. He documented his aspiration in the 1962 Economic Report to Congress.

The President permitted his Council of Economic Advisers, then headed by Walter W. Heller, to chart the deficiency of the Nation's industrial effort—the gap between potential and actual output of goods and services, and what it would take to close it.

This graphic portrayal of deficiency has been repeated in every Economic Report since. Thus, the 1965 report indicates that if manpower and machines had been more fully utilized in 1964, if the unemployment rate had been only 4 percent of the labor force instead of 5 percent the gross national product (GNP) would have been $649 billion, not $622 billion.

The Nation, according to the chart (not printed in RECORD), operated at 90 percent of potential, a far better record than in early 1961, when the country was just emerging from the 1960 recession. Then the shortfall (at an annual rate) was 9 percent.

In the immediate months ahead, economic momentum and psychology could further narrow the gap. Expectations are changing. The widely accepted 1965 forecast "first-half up, second-half also up, but not so fast," is tilting higher. Says the latest Morgan Guaranty Survey: "There are emerging hints of greater underlying buoyancy * * * than was projected in most year-end business forecasts."

Sure, strike-charged activity in autos and steel has accelerated production. The Federal Reserve Board index advanced to a new high, 138.8 in February, as against 138.1 in January and 128.2 in February a year ago. Nevertheless, an 8-percent gain in 12 months is a notable achievement.

Even more important, capital outlays of corporations on plant and equipment are expected to increase 12 percent this year. The confidence multiplier is at work, providing jobs, increasing demand for raw materials, adding to consumer buying power. This should make up for the sag (and then some) in housing starts, which in February were at an annual rate of 1,422,000 compared with the abnormally high rate of 1,650,000 a year ago.

President Johnson has lifted minds above the immediate. He has rejuvenated America's tired sense of destiny. In his civil rights address to Congress, he could utter

words which, were the Nation in a different mood, would be described as corny: "I want to be the President who helped feed the hungry and to prepare them to be taxpayers instead of taxeaters. I want to be the President who helped the poor to find their own way."

His war on poverty has directed young hearts away from the materialistic outlook of the organization man.

Now youngsters parade, argue over free speech, join the Peace Corps, go to homes of underprivileged families to tutor youngsters whose parents have no educational background, and have a sense of social opportunity: Being their brothers' helpers.

As an example, 4,500 persons quickly joined the Volunteers in the Service to America—VISTA. Reward: Subsistence in an underprivileged home and a sense of mission. This was no downy 9 to 5 stint with opportunity for advancement. It was rugged living—24 hours a day in a strange, impoverished environment.

The American economic miracle has been characterized by ever-expanding consumption, ever rising living standards for a larger and larger portion of the population. President Johnson is using an old formula but with new force. He hopes to accelerate this historic process.

He is, in a sense, hothousing the growth of the middle class through education and example. This will enrich all families, corporations and stockholders. Yes, even the Government, by creating more taxpayers.

And in the process, we could close the gap between achievement and potential.

[From Business Week, Mar. 6, 1965]

CHANGING THE RULES ON GROWTH: BROOKINGS STUDY SAYS GAINS IN EQUIPMENT EFFICIENCY MAKE FASTEST EXPANSION POSSIBLE

Observers of the current long business upswing can't help feeling that there has been a fundamental change in the way the U.S. economy works.

The growth rate has stepped up to 5 percent per year—measured in real terms. Yet wholesale prices remain stable; unemployment clings close to the 5 percent mark; industry still operates without pressure developing upon capacity; and capital spending shows a tendency toward slow decline as a percentage of total national output.

The underlying factor that has made this remarkable performance possible is better capital equipment—that is, capital equipment that produces more output for a dollar's worth of investment.

The evidence: That's the major conclusion that emerges from a new Brookings Institution study, "Investment Demand and Economic Growth," by Bert Hickman.

The Hickman study shows that in 1948, a dollar's worth of capital invested in plant and equipment produced, on the average, 72 cents worth of output a year. By 1957, a dollar's worth of capital stock was yielding an annual output of 85 cents. And in 1962—the last year for which Hickman provides an estimate—$1 in capital stock was yielding 92 cents in output. All these figures are stated in terms of constant dollars. Thus, from 1948 to 1962, the real increase in the productivity of capital equipment was 28 percent.

Of course, that figure represents the average gain for the entire economy. The gains in the productivity of capital differed widely from industry to industry.

Way up: For example, in the chemical industry, the productivity of $1 worth of capital in 1948 was 68 cents; by 1962, this had risen to $1.35—a 99 percent gain. In nonautomotive transportation—mostly airlines—the gain was from 98 cents in 1948 to $2.70 in 1962, a 176 percent rise. Public utilities climbed from 14 to 25 cents, a 79 percent increase.

By contrast, the productivity of a dollar invested in railroad equipment and stock rose only from 21 cents in 1948 to 22 cents in 1962, a 5 percent gain. Rather strikingly, the gain in the productivity of the machinery industry, as estimated by Hickman, was also only 5 percent over the 14-year period. But this may reflect the high productivity already achieved in that industry in 1948, when $1 worth of stock of equipment yielded an annual output of $2.38; by 1962, this figure had reached $2.50.

Since the annual output of a dollar's worth of capital varies so between industries, it's inevitable that the average productivity of plant and equipment for the entire economy will vary over the years as the product mix of the capital stock shifts. For instance, an economy investing heavily in computers may get more extra efficiency per dollar than one investing chiefly in steel rails and box cars.

Thus, prior to World War I, when the bulk of investment was in railroads, public utilities, and heavy capital goods, the annual output that could be produced by a dollar's investment showed a declining trend. Since World War I, with the continuous shift toward highly efficient machinery, productivity of capital has been climbing.

I. WHAT THIS MEANS

For the individual company, increased productivity of capital obviously means lower costs—and a chance to boost profits. For the whole economy, it means faster growth in the potential output—that is, faster growth in what the economy is capable of producing if its capital and labor resources are fully utilized. But this does not necessarily mean that the economy will actually grow faster in any given year or period. If the management of the economy is clumsy or wrongheaded, this faster growth in potential output may cause economic stagnation.

Hickman shows in great detail that the increasing productivity of capital played a major role in the sluggish growth of the U.S. economy during the 1957–62 period. Because demand for the growing total potential output of the economy was not strong enough, unemployment increased, excess capacity grew, and this slowed the rate of capital spending. The result was the "in-between years" that marked the end of the Eisenhower administration and the start of the Kennedy administration. The period ended when bolder fiscal policy—especially the big 1964 tax cut—strengthened demand for what the more efficient U.S. economy was fully capable of producing.

Bold policy needed: Hickman believes that a continuing increase in the efficiency of capital goods will create a need for bold fiscal policy through the rest of this decade if the economy is to operate close to full employment.

He reasons that, given the growth of the labor force and of productivity, the economy will have to grow by about 4 percent a year, if it is to avoid an increase in unemployment. Consumption has been growing approximately parallel to the growth of the entire economy. But, because of the increasing efficiency of capital, plant, and equipment, spending has been growing more slowly than the total economy. In fact, Hickman estimates that a full-employment course to 1970 would require capital spending to grow only one-half as fast as gross national product. If these trends continue, some other major component of GNP—such as residential construction or Government spending—will have to grow faster than GNP, in order to offset the relative decline in capital spending.

Assuming that the economy was approximately at a full employment level in 1964 and will stay fully employed for the rest of the decade, Hickman's projections indicate that capital spending would decline from 9.4 percent of GNP in 1964 to 8.2 percent in 1970, a decrease of about 13 percent.

Old problems remain: Hickman argues that the future will repeat the problems of the past 7 years. Looking back, he says that it was theoretically conceivable that the offsetting factor to declining capital spending in 1957–62 could have been residential construction or inventories. But he believes this would have been unlikely under the conditions prevailing then. He concludes that only an active, stimulative budget policy would have put the economy on a stronger growth trend.

During the 1957–62 period, Federal tax rates and spending were such that the budget would have run surpluses ranging from $4.5 billion to $12.1 billion, if full employment had been attained. Those potential surpluses would have been too great a drag for private sectors of the economy to overcome, as Hickman reads history. Only by a combination of higher Government spending and a big tax reduction, he holds, could the drag have been reduced and businesses and the whole economy have reaped the benefit of higher rates of capital efficiency.

II. LOOKING AHEAD

Hickman's view is that stimulative fiscal policies—implying frequent budget deficits—will be needed from now to 1970 to keep the economy on a full employment growth path. He does note that one possible way to make it easier to attain and maintain full employment would be to reduce the rate of private savings—and to shift toward higher rates of growth in private consumption.

But neither Hickman nor other economists raising this possibility think it likely to happen—presumably because the percentage of disposable income that consumers save has been remarkably stable at around 7 percent. This saving habit promises to continue into the future, and doesn't seem to be much affected—except for short-run interludes—by changing tax rates.

Some chance: Yet there is a chance that the savings ratio may slip lower as a result of consumers' own decisions. This has happened before. According to studies by Harvard's Simon S. Kuznets—the leading authority on past longrun savings and investment trends in the U.S. economy—individuals saved about 11 percent of disposable income in the last quarter of the 19th century, and about 9 percent of disposable income during the non-war period between 1900 and 1930. The 7 percent rate is only about a generation old.

Moreover, since young families save a smaller percentage of their income, the shifting age distribution of the U.S. population—which is getting younger as it grows—may reduce the savings ratio below the 7-percent average.

Another possibility: There's also a chance that the current trend of climbing productivity per dollar of capital investment will reverse itself. That, too, as Kuznets' studies show, has happened before. Though this appears unlikely in the few years between now and 1970, it could happen in the longer run—possibly as a result of shifts toward heavy investment in areas such as atomic energy or new urban transportation systems. Kuznets, in fact, concludes that the U.S. long-range problem is likely to be undersaving, rather than oversaving, relative to investment needs.

For the near term, however, the Hickman study will tend to support the school of thought that thinks either more Government spending, or more tax cuts, are essential to keep the economy growing at high-employment rates.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 1965]

THE CHALLENGE OF GROWTH

Economic growth is a double-edged sword. While it confers immediate benefits in the

shape of goods and services, it also poses challenges for the future to which a viable society must respond. One of those challenges, that of providing gainful employment for a burgeoning labor force, is delineated in projections for the years 1970 and 1980 recently published by the Department of Labor.

The labor force—those working or actively seeking work—now numbers 76 million. By 1970, assuming a continuation of current economic and demographic trends, it should rise to 86 million, and by 1980 the addition of 15 million more entrants will bring the total up to 101 million.

Of the 9 million persons who will enter the labor force by 1970, one-half are expected to be young workers under the age of 25. Since great difficulties are now being encountered in finding employment for inexperienced workers, the Labor Department projections suggest that a redoubling of efforts to provide adequate training and a rapidly expanding economy are imperative. An average of 1.5 million jobs must be created merely to absorb the new labor force, and we shall have to do much better than that in order to offset the effects of increasing productivity.

FLIGHT BY ASTRONAUTS VIRGIL GRISSOM AND JOHN YOUNG

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, Tuesday, March 23, was indeed a proud day for America.

Astronauts Virgil Grissom and John Young successfully orbited the earth three times in their Gemini III spacecraft, the Molly Brown.

This historic flight holds great import for the future. The fact that the astronauts were able to control the flight of the spaceship was significant. Gemini III was flown forward, backward, and upsidedown in its flight of 4 hours and 54 minutes, preparing the way for rendezvous missions to be performed at a later time. These maneuvers introduced a new era of manned flight in space.

I was proud to join our Vice President and six Senate colleagues—Senators MONRONEY, CANNON, HOLLAND, FONG, PROUTY, and JORDAN—as well as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, not only to witness the flight, but to have a chance to inspect the Apollo project and to talk with the scientists, technicians, and workers who implement America's space program.

The blast-off and the entire flight was an awesome spectacle.

One is keenly aware of the courage and the skill of the astronauts, and we are proud, indeed, that our own Major Grissom is the only man ever to have ridden twice in a spaceship.

Our visit and inspection tour of Launch Complex 39 at the Kennedy Space Center's 88,000-acre spaceport on Merritt Island was breathtaking.

Complex 39 was designed for the lunar Apollo Saturn V vehicle—the one that will land a man on the moon. A vehicle assembly building is being constructed here, to be the world's largest structure in terms of volume, stretching over 525 feet in the Florida sky. It will accommodate four Apollo Saturn V vehicles simultaneously in vertical position.

The launch vehicle and Apollo spacecraft will be assembled on a massive mobile launcher over 400 feet tall and weighing 10,600,000 pounds.

When the launch vehicle and the Apollo spacecraft are completed, they will be moved by a vehicle known as the crawler-transporter over a 3-mile, specially built roadway designed to support loads of approximately 18 million pounds.

Thousands of dedicated engineers, scientists, technicians, and support personnel at Cape Kennedy, in Government, and in industry are laboring ceaselessly to achieve many firsts in man's conquest of space for peaceful and scientific purposes.

Their accomplishments confirm the total acceptance of the immense challenge of space exploration.

I commend these dedicated Americans for their impressive contributions to the space era, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to continue their support of the space program.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The promise of America is opportunity for our people. It must therefore be a matter of concern to all Americans when any of our fellow citizens is denied the chance to build a full life for himself and his family.

Yet this is the condition of life for millions of our fellow citizens in areas of distress scattered across the continent.

At a time of instant communication and swift transport it is difficult to realize how varied are the regions of this country. Abundance and opportunity, progress and hope are, however, not evenly spread over the land. The same diversity of conditions which contributes to the richness of our society and culture, also bears with harsh inequality on those in stricken stretches of America.

A wide array of programs and weapons has been called into action to make sure no American is denied opportunity because of his race, or lack of education, or the poverty of his birth.

As our people more fully realize their human potential, we must be sure that the economic potential in all areas and regions is also realized. Indeed, in order to be fully effective, education programs, health programs, the programs of the war on poverty, and many other activities require complementary efforts to promote sound economic conditions and the proper physical environment.

Opportunity should not be closed to any person because of the circumstances of the area in which he lives.

Moreover the distress or underdevelopment of any part of the country holds back the progress of the entire Nation. This has been one of the great lessons of the last 30 years. Region after region from the Deep South to the Far West has been brought into the mainstream of our economic life. The consequence has been increased vitality and strength, not only in those areas whose resources had been previously underemployed, but for the Nation as a whole. Nonetheless, much remains to be done.

A growing nation cannot afford to waste those resources, human and natural, which are now too often neglected and unused in distressed areas. We cannot afford the loss of buying power and of national growth which flow from widespread poverty. Above all, we cannot afford to shut out large numbers of our fellow citizens from the fulfillment of hope which is shared by the rest. For that would be the denial of the promise of America itself.

The troubles and the potentials of depressed areas which contain approximately 27 million people vary widely. They are scattered across almost every section of the country. But they share certain common characteristics.

Nearly always their population growth is well below the national average, and often it is declining. Large areas in Illinois, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and elsewhere have lost more than 20 percent of their population in the last decade, while America as a whole was increasing its numbers by almost as much.

This pattern of decline is a symptom of economic distress. For in these areas employment and income are far below the national average. Unemployment rates of 10 to 15 percent are not uncommon. In dozens of counties more than 50 percent of all families have annual incomes of less than $2,000.

Worst of all, the distressed area is usually caught in a web of circumstances which block progress and lead to further decline.

Young people are forced to leave school earlier to help support their families, thus depriving themselves of needed skills and knowledge. Many young people must leave families and homes behind them in search of greater opportunity, stripping the area of badly needed skill and energy. Older men and women tend to stay on, clinging to the communities and friends which have been part of their lives and which enrich their existence.

As income goes down, these areas are less and less able to support schools, hospitals, and other public facilities needed to train their people and otherwise equip them to meet the demands of modern life. They are often too poor to provide the public structures—from roads to water—needed to attract new business and new jobs. The result is a steadily mounting toll in human poverty and retardation of the Nation's progress.

To break this downward spiral, to restore vitality and forward motion to America's distressed areas, I recommend a program of area and regional economic development—focused upon the economic needs of distressed areas and aimed at providing the conditions which can lead to growth. This program will be based primarily upon the experience of the accelerated public works program, the Area Redevelopment Admin-

istration, and the Appalachian Regional Development Commission.

The economic development of distressed areas, like that of a nation, is an enormously complex process. It requires work and cooperation from both public and private enterprise. It requires partnership between officials at every level of government—local, county, State, and Federal. It demands attention to a wide diversity of development needs—from improved transportation and water supply to industrial incentives and public facilities. It means that the varied resources and abilities of each region must be harnessed in a concerted effort to build a solid economic base for increasing industry, bringing with it more jobs and higher income.

In this effort we build upon the invaluable experience of the experimental area redevelopment program carried on for the last 4 years.

First, ARA has shown that helping businessmen to expand or to build new plants, coupled with financial assistance to provide needed public facilities, can produce new jobs.

As of January 31, 1965, the Area Redevelopment Administration had approved 548 projects of which over 300 were in rural areas. These projects have and will assist in the creation of over 115,000 jobs. According to a recent study, more than three out of every four persons now working on ARA-assisted projects were not working full time prior to their present jobs. All of these jobs were in new, expanded, or restored facilities.

Second, ARA has shown that the cost to the Government of creating these jobs is less than the cost of supporting these workers and their families through public assistance programs.

It has been estimated that, taking into account all outlays, the average nonreturnable one-time cost to the Federal Government for each job is about $800. More than this is saved in not having to pay unemployment compensation and welfare benefits to persons employed as a result of ARA activities. The cost is made once—the benefits continue as long as the jobs last.

Third, ARA has shown that people in our communities will work together in economic self-help programs.

Under the area redevelopment program, more than 1,000 local committees have been formed to work on overall economic development programs. Some of the programs are producing dividends without any other Federal aid whatsoever.

Fourth, ARA has shown that counties can be advantageously grouped together to promote cooperation on problems of mutual economic interest.

Under the area redevelopment program some 75 multicounty programs have been approved. The counties of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, for example, are tackling common problems with their own regional organization called UPCAP. The counties of southeastern Ohio are jointly organized through Ohio University to assist in the growth of local industries. Northeastern Pennsylvania is working under the leadership of Wilkes College to plan and carry out an areawide economic development program.

Drawing on this past experience we can now move ahead with a long-range program of area and regional economic development to assist in restoring economic health to distressed areas of America.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

Under the new program three basic principles will guide our action.

First, we will devote maximum effort to providing the conditions under which our private enterprise system can provide jobs and increased income. It is up to private business to take advantage of improved conditions for making profits by expanding present businesses or starting new ones, thereby increasing opportunity for the people of the region.

Second, no Federal plan or Federal project will be imposed on any regional, State, or local body. No area will be declared distressed by Federal decree. No economic development district will be designated unless the State and local people want it to be designated. No plan will be approved unless it also has the approval of State and local authorities. No programs or projects will be originated at the Federal level. The initiative, the ideas, and the request for assistance must all come to Washington, not from Washington.

Third, the Federal Government will seek full value from every dollar spent or loaned under this program. Every proposal will be tested to see if it offers substantial promise of increasing economic development commensurate with the Federal funds involved. Only if a project meets this test will it be approved. Over the years the increased economic activity stimulated by this program will return its cost many times to the Federal Treasury.

ORGANIZATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

A key feature of this new program is the proposal to group together distressed counties and communities in economically viable development districts. Planning and assistance will concentrate on the needs of the area as a whole, as well as on individual counties and towns. Moreover, for planning many programs it makes sense to work in terms of larger regions encompassing in some cases parts of two or more States.

This is merely the recognition of a simple fact. Neither distress nor the potential for development respects State, county, or community boundaries. The economies of many areas are an organic whole. Just as many counties have declined together, they must advance together if they are to advance at all.

For individual counties and communities are often not capable of individual growth. Their industry must draw upon workers from other areas, and this means educated and trained workers must be available. Factories in communities in other counties can offer employment and rising income to their people. Large-scale public facilities can be built most economically if they are designed to serve the needs of a large area. Many other Federal programs, such as assistance in the construction of hospitals, can be carried on more effectively if they are consistent with a genuine, regionwide program of development.

Often places which are not themselves in distress can with help and stimulation provide new jobs for the people of a surrounding distressed region.

Grouping counties together will permit assistance to be concentrated on those communities and industries whose rapid development offers the most hope for all the people of a region.

Thus we hope to work with regions which contain all the components of economic advance, unhampered by rigid boundaries.

The new organization for development will have four main components:

First, redevelopment areas: The counties and labor commuting areas which are the basic units of the region, and where employment and income figures reveal conditions of distress and provide a measure of progress.

Second, economic development districts: Organizations of distressed areas—generally multicounty in nature—which will work together on common problems and can sustain economic growth once the development process is started.

Third, action planning commissions for regions: Multi-State regions where comprehensive, long-range economic planning can be carried out by joint Federal-State Commissions, to solve economic problems too large or difficult to be dealt with on a local basis.

Fourth, economic development centers: The places where resources can be most swiftly and effectively used to create more jobs and higher income for the people of the surrounding area. These centers may or may not themselves be distressed. Successful development is frequently easier to achieve when a number of activities are located in a single community large enough to offer the advantages which flow from size itself. Clusters of industry tend to attract other industry. And such clusters offer the prospect of increased economic activity and improved economic health of the entire area.

To implement this design for development I recommend that the Secretary of Commerce be given authority to: First, designate redevelopment areas on the basis of data relating to unemployment or income; second, work with States to organize multicounty economic development districts; third, include in such districts economic development centers not otherwise eligible for designation as redevelopment areas; and fourth, invite and encourage States to establish multi-State regional action planning commissions to prepare long-range action programs to improve the economic growth of the region.

This program, national in scope, is intended to aid those areas most in need of assistance throughout the country. Accordingly, it is necessary to provide objective criteria to determine those areas qualified for assistance under the program, and thus the bill contains measurable standards for eligibility based on either unemployment or median family income statistics. Qualifying unemployment data would be the same as in

the Area Redevelopment Act. In addition, counties could qualify if the median family income is less than 40 percent of the national median.

Indian areas would be designated after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior.

When there has been a sudden plant shutdown or closing of a military installation, the Secretary would be authorized to designate areas for assistance if he determines that the area can be expected to become eligible within 3 years unless assistance is provided.

The program will contain standards which insure that aid is concentrated on areas of real need, and that it is being distributed on an objective basis.

INSTRUMENTS OF DEVELOPMENT

Our experience with various forms of assistance under ARA and the accelerated public works program has shown us ways to improve our techniques and our tools for providing economic growth.

DIRECT GRANT PROGRAM

I recommend a direct grant program for development facilities related to economic development and matched at 50 percent of the cost of the project. In addition, because of the long-term economic depression in many of the depressed areas, I am recommending authorization of supplementary grants to help the most needy communities to meet their matching share of Federal grant-in-aid programs. Additional Federal assistance up to 80 percent of the net project cost would be made available to communities unable to take advantage of regular Federal programs because of their inability to raise the required local share. These supplemental payments to needy communities would be limited to programs assisting in the construction or equipment of development facility projects, including those eligible for 50 percent grants under this proposed legislation.

An annual authorization of $250 million for grants for development facilities and supplemental payments is being requested.

LOAN PROGRAMS

The existing ARA program of loans for land, building, machinery, and equipment has provided loans at 4 percent interest, of up to 65 percent of the cost of the project for industrial or commercial facilities. As of January 31, 1965, 396 projects have been approved under this program amounting to an investment of $173 million in ARA funds.

Private capital has participated with the Federal Government to a great extent in these projects. All told, approximately $127 million has been invested in these projects from all non-Federal sources, of which some 300 private banking institutions have invested more than $40 million.

Nevertheless, we need to do more to encourage greater utilization of private capital in redevelopment projects. To this end, I propose that the Secretary of Commerce be authorized to reimburse approved borrowers 2 percentage points of the cost of interest to them for up to 10 years on money borrowed from private institutions for expansion or establishment of plants in redevelopment areas in accordance with the development programs.

This proposal will stimulate greater use of private capital in recovery and development. Moreover, it avoids tying up large blocks of Federal funds over long periods of time. The Federal Government's share of these new contracts during any one year would be limited to $5 million. This would facilitate and encourage $250 million of private investment annually in depressed areas.

I am also recommending that authority be granted to guarantee working capital loans up to 90 percent. These guarantees would be available to supplement other financial assistance under this program.

The present ARA program of low-cost 40-year loans for development facilities would be continued largely unchanged under the new program.

These direct loans and loan guarantees would be available to firms where their activities promise to create increased long-term employment.

An annual authorization of $170 million is recommended for a revolving fund, which would include direct loans for commercial and industrial facilities, loans for development facilities, and reserve for working capital guarantees.

The present requirement in the Area Redevelopment Act that State or local public agencies provide 10 percent of the cost of industrial projects, and that local investors must wait until the Federal loan has been entirely repaid before receiving repayment of principal, has worked a hardship on many needy communities. Accordingly, I am recommending that this requirement be reduced to 5 percent of the project cost and that repayment be concurrent with repayment of the Federal loan. In exceptionally needy cases, the Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to waive the 5-percent requirement. However, in no case will there be a waiver of the requirement that at least 15 percent of the total project cost be invested as equity or on a lien subordinate to that of the Federal investment.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

It is not enough to simply help finance projects. These projects must be part of a comprehensive plan to build a viable economy. To do this we must provide technical assistance and encourage the formation of development organizations large enough to hire trained people to prepare comprehensive plans and carry them out. For these purposes, I am recommending the following new types of assistance:

Grants and technical assistance to regional action planning commissions to enable them to prepare long-range regional economic development programs within the context of overall industrial, transportation, recreation, and other natural resource planning. An annual authorization of $15 million is proposed for this purpose.

Grants and technical assistance to multicounty economic development districts for formulating overall economic development plans.

Additional Federal grants of 10 percent for development facility projects which are part of an approved district development plan, as a special incentive to encourage communities to work together.

Federal grants and loans for designated economic development centers in order that economic development districts will have resources sufficient to sustain their growth.

For the last two purposes I am recommending an authorization of $50 million. To allow ample time for the States to prepare well-thought-out action programs, no projects would be approved under this authorization until 1 year after enactment of the legislation.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

This enlarged and redirected program of economic development will be administered by the Department of Commerce, which has also been responsible for the existing experimental program. The legislation I am proposing would create the position of Economic Development Administrator in that Department. The functions and powers of the existing Area Redevelopment Administration would be transferred to a successor organization to be created by the Secretary of Commerce to administer the new act.

Many other Federal programs also can contribute to the economic development of distressed areas. It is essential that these programs be closely coordinated to make sure resources are used with maximum effectiveness in reaching the common goal of a higher standard of living for the people of these regions. Therefore, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to work closely with interested departments and agencies in achieving a coordinated Federal effort. It is especially important that this effort be carried forward in close cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The antipoverty program will help people improve their ability to obtain and hold a job. This program is designed to increase the number of jobs available to those who want to work. Obviously both efforts are essential to the future growth of distressed areas. I intend to see that they work closely together toward the common objective.

CONCLUSION

There are three important things to remember about this program. First, it is designed to extend opportunity to those now deprived of a full chance to share in the blessings of American life. As such it has a call upon the moral conscience of every citizen.

Second, it will benefit all Americans. The experience of the last 30 years has shown conclusively that the increasing prosperity of any region of this country increases the prosperity of the Nation. We have truly become a national economy. Higher incomes for the people of Illinois or Arkansas mean increased markets for automobiles from Detroit and steel from Pittsburgh. Poverty in one area slows progress in other areas.

Third, the job can be done. We have the resources and the skill to extend American abundance to every citizen and every region of this land. This

program will help give us the instruments to match our determination to eliminate poverty in America.

The conditions of our distressed areas today are among our most important economic problems. They hold back the progress of the Nation, and breed a despair and poverty which is inexcusable in the richest land on earth. We will not permit any part of this country to be a prison where hopes are crushed, human beings chained to misery, and the promise of America denied.

The conditions of our depressed areas can and must be righted. In this generation they will be righted.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1965.*

AREA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TITLE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senate has just received the President's message on area and regional economic development. In this message, he has made recommendations which are focused upon the economic needs of distressed areas, and directed at providing the conditions which can lead to growth and to improvement of the towns and counties in which the people of these areas want to maintain their residence.

I welcome the recommendations of the President, and I am pleased to note that he has based these recommendations primarily upon the experience of the accelerated public works program, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and also the Appalachian Regional Development Commission, which helped develop the Appalachian bill the Congress enacted this year. I know that the committees of both the House and Senate will give careful consideration to these proposals, and I want to comment only briefly on the main points made in the message to the Congress.

As one who has spoken and voted for the accelerated public works program, I am glad that a program of direct grants for 50 percent of the cost of constructing public facilities related to economic development is included in the message. More importantly, the request for an annual authorization of $250 million for this program, including a provision for greater assistance for communities whose financial condition makes them unable to raise the required local share, would place this program on a regular basis—a procedure I have long urged to meet the needs in many areas of our country that want to work to share in the economic growth and affluence of the rest of the Nation.

The request for an annual authorization of $170 million for a revolving fund which would provide loans for commercial and industrial facilities, for connected public facilities, and for working capital guarantees, is one which deserves close study by the Congress. In addition, the new recommendations for authorizations of funds for technical assistance on a multicounty basis, and in connection with the full development of regional resources, are proposals which I know the committees will review carefully.

The ARA program has been one which has stimulated enterprise and created jobs in many parts of our country, but it has also had its problems which have been recognized as the agency developed its experience to meet different needs in different sections of our country. I hope that attention will be given to these proposals, to a study of the accomplishments of the program since its beginning in 1961, and to the need for revisions and improvements which many of us have urged in the Senate for many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). What is the will of the Senate?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PROPOSED CUT IN SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE BUDGET

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a crisis which is developing in the Nation's vital soil conservation efforts. I speak of the administration's proposal to cut $20,130,000 from the Soil Conservation Service budget for 1966, and to establish a revolving fund to absorb this loss.

The dominant conservation problem on the non-Federal rural lands today is soil erosion. A recent study made by the Department of Agriculture—the "National Inventory of Soil and Water Conservation Needs"—reveals that conservation problems are inadequately treated on 62 percent of the country's cropland, 73 percent of non-Federal pasture and range, and 55 percent of non-Federal forest and woodland.

Great strides, however, have been made in recent years toward developing proper conservation practices. In the forefront of these efforts has been the Soil Conservation Service. Of particular importance has been the technical assistance provided by the Service to the individual landowner in helping him to plan and develop conservation practices.

It is proposed to cut funds for these technical services from the budget and to substitute in its place a revolving fund. This would force soil conservation districts, or individual landowners and operators, to pay to the Service up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished.

Mr. President, this proposal will seriously jeopardize water resource development in this country. We are not moving fast enough in this area now. We need more funds, not less. I believe that the revolving fund plan is unworkable and can lead only to a decline in proper conservation practices. Districts unable to offset the $20 million would be forced to reduce proportionately the technical staff providing assistance.

In Indiana, for instance, the impact of the budget cut would be severe. More than $230,000 would have to be raised each year to maintain the program at present levels. About 70 man-years of technical time would be lost without the funds.

Perhaps this budget cut is proposed as an economy measure. Action to reduce Government spending is laudable in many instances, but here we have a clear case of false economy. By failing to fund this relatively small cost for valuable technical know-how, we will bring about enormous dollar losses in soil, crops, water and wildlife.

The problem of water resource development and land management is national in scope and affects every one of our citizens. We cannot expect the small landowner to bear the entire burden of conservation costs. He already pays a percentage of construction costs and all of the maintenance costs. It should be recognized that urban people, too, benefit significantly from a balanced watershed development. Urban residents want unpolluted streams, recreation areas and attractive countrysides. The public interest requires an increase—not a decrease—in funds for these purposes.

I urge every Senator to study this problem carefully and to join me in opposing any effort to reduce or hinder our land and water conservation programs.

GENERAL SCHRIEVER ON COMPUTER SYSTEMS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a speech on the use of computers in the Air Force, which operates more than 500 of them as the heart of its systems management program, recently came to my desk. It was written by Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commander of the Air Force Systems Command, and was given at the 11th Annual Data Processing Conference of the American Management Association.

Because of the importance of data processing and because of the contents of General Schriever's remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

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

THE EVOLUTION AND CHALLENGE OF SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

It is a distinct pleasure to take part in this conference on "Management and the Computer." I see from the program that the computer portion of your conference has been covered by the speakers and panelists who are experts in data processing and management information systems. I would like to discuss the management aspect, drawing specifically on the Air Force experience in managing the largest military development program in the Nation's history—the ICBM.

Let me begin with a few observations about the place of the computer in the management picture. Military requirements, of course, have greatly stimulated the pace of computer development. Today the Air Force operates more than 500 computers. They are at the heart of many of our systems, especially command and control systems. They enable us to perform tasks that would be simply impossible without them.

It seems to me that the new challenges to computer systems and designers and those

which constantly face management are similar in at least two ways:

First, the computer, like the management approaches we adopt, must be placed in its proper perspective in our way of life. It must be fitted into our free enterprise system. Among other things, it will be measured by its contribution to our national economy and to our industrial base.

Second, the computer, like any other resource, must be capable of supporting decisionmaking in the most economical and effective manner. It must be competitive among other alternatives.

Simply stated, my view of the computer in management is that it should assist top management in making better big decisions. A misuse of the computer is to use it to participate in all decisions. I think this kind of misuse often occurs because the computer is still a mystery to much of the top management. Too many specialists and interpreters get into the act—in the so-called software area. We must work toward computer systems which will allow the manager and the computer to communicate directly, and we believe that technology can provide this capability.

The Air Force faced the same challenges in managing the ballistic missile program. We not only needed to take full advantage of the free enterprise system, and find the approach which best supported the decisionmakers, but we also needed to make fullest use of our valuable scientific, technological, and industrial resources. I believe that the lessons we learned remain valid today and for the years ahead.

At the outset of the ICBM program in 1954 we faced two categories of problems—one which involved technology and one which involved management. A committee of prominent scientists advised us that both categories of problems could be solved, but that each demanded a special approach. Our success in solving the technological problems is a matter of record. The extent to which that success depended upon the evolution of management needs to be better known.

During the late 1940's and early 1950's the management problems associated with weapon systems acquisition had been relatively simple. We could normally start by designing a basic aircraft and then install the "black boxes," such as communications equipment, radar, armament, and other more or less off-the-shelf items. In short, our approach involved straightforward engineering. A systems engineering approach carefully integrating the various subsystems was not necessary.

But the ICBM required a whole new dimension of management. It involved a whole variety of technical problems, which often had to be solved simultaneously. The overall task—from initial concept to the deployment of the missiles in operational sites across the Nation—was unprecedented in size, cost, and urgency.

We had the military resources, the scientific resources, the industrial resources, and the manpower to develop this radically new weapon system. But we needed to find the way to harness these resources effectively—to weld them into an effective instrument that could meet the urgent challenge facing the Nation. This was primarily a challenge to management, and the challenge today is not too different from what it was 11 years ago.

Should we meet this challenge by trying to achieve a rapid buildup of Air Force in-house resources, at the cost of many millions of dollars for Government facilities? This is the traditional "arsenal" approach. There were two compelling reasons for rejecting it. First of all, it ran directly contrary to the Air Force philosophy of drawing directly on the Nation's vast scientific and industrial resources. Secondly, and more important, this approach would not allow us to rapidly attract, motivate, and employ all the outstanding scientists, engineers, and managers who were needed.

What was the alternative? After consulting leading scientists and industrial executives, the Air Force decided to reaffirm its basic philosophy of employing the total resources in the scientific and industrial community.

Immediately we faced the question of how to organize and manage this effort. A review of both Government and industrial capabilities revealed that no single organization had sufficient expertise in all the technical fields involved in developing the ICBM. This fact led the Air Force to adopt the concept of an associate contractor team working directly with the Air Force. This concept permitted the Air Force to have a direct contract with each of several major specialized contractors, thus taking advantage of the specialized capabilities available and making possible closer management control.

Because of the size and complexity of the ICBM program it was necessary to form a separate and independent organization to perform the critical function of systems engineering and technical direction (SE/TD). This is a unique discipline which requires an extremely high degree of competence. The associate contractor approach, together with the use of the independent SE/TD group, insured that we made use of the outstanding talent of the Nation, whether in government, industry, or the universities. In addition, the associate contractor structure provided competition in both cost and technical excellence.

The success of this approach is now a matter of record. In spite of the fact that the ICBM program was a pioneering effort on a scale never before attempted and involved a whole new dimension of technical complexity, it succeeded beyond all expectations. The range, payload, and accuracy of today's ballistic missiles far exceed the most optimistic predictions. Furthermore, they were developed ahead of schedule.

We were able to achieve these results through a management approach in which we carried on a number of activities concurrently. These activities included development, test and evaluation; establishment of a logistic system; training of people; construction of technical and operational facilities; and production. If these had been done in sequence, the leadtime for the total system would have been much longer and the overhead costs would have been greater. Thus the concurrency approach made it possible to save both time and money. This latter advantage is not always recognized.

Obviously some degree of concurrency is involved in the development of any major weapon system, but this does not always or necessarily mean concurrency in technical development. I want to stress this point. Concurrency has often been taken to mean stretching the state-of-the-art, but this is not the case. Technology is only one element of the total system acquisition. Depending on circumstances, we can take an approach involving high technical risk, as with the ICBM, or low technical risk, as with the C–141 jet transport or take an approach somewhere in between. But in each case concurrency is involved in the system acquisition cycle.

We must always use judgment in employing this management concept, as we must in employing any management concept. It is simply not possible to take a single management approach and say, "This is the only way to develop a new system." Rather, our approach should always be appropriate to the task we have to do—considering the size, the cost, the urgency, and technical risk involved, and other relevant factors.

This brings me to a second consideration which has affected the evolution of systems management, and that is the constant challenge to shorten the time cycle for systems development, while at the same time making maximum use of the potential of technology. This problem is not unique to the military. To the businessman it might take the form of the following two questions: Do we want to use today's technology and hardware to build a product that may be equal to or perhaps marginally superior to our competitor's products, but which is available relatively soon? Or do we want to assume a certain risk and build a product which will require some new technology but which will be definitely superior to the products our competitors are building?

To translate these questions into the language of military systems development, the first approach might be called the use of "hardware building blocks." The second would then be called the use of "technological building blocks."

Each of these approaches has certain advantages and certain drawbacks. The use of hardware building blocks minimizes the technological and economic risks, but at the same time it introduces the real risk of early obsolescence. This may not only be dangerous from a military point of view, but may actually cost more money in the long run. The use of technological building blocks, on the other hand, involves technical risk, but it was this approach which enabled us to create today's superior ballistic missile force in time to meet the Soviet ICBM challenge. Future challenges may very well demand that we follow the same approach. With today's broad spectrum of technology and its continuing evolution, there is no doubt that technical superiority is combat superiority.

We must strive to attain the best balance between hardware and technological building blocks, between concurrent and sequential activities, and among the often conflicting considerations of time, cost, technical risk, and operational requirements. We can attain this balance only if we remain clear about the results we need to achieve.

The most important result of this evolution in Air Force management is the strategic superiority which our Nation enjoys today. But there are also a number of substantial side benefits. Let me mention a few of them. First, by relying on the total resources to be found within the scientific and industrial community, we have avoided the buildup of a multibillion-dollar Government network of facilities. Second, we have encouraged and maintained a strong, competent, up-to-date industrial base composed of all areas of technical endeavor. Third, we have insured that healthy industrial competition is always available and flourishes in such specialized fields as guidance, propulsion, reentry vehicles, and so forth. In this way we have not only contributed to building the industrial base for our national space program but have also fostered numerous commercial applications of new technology.

Thus the management approach which evolved in the ICBM development effort not only achieved its objective of creating a superior missile force, but at the same time provided a direct input to the national economy. This fact is worth noting, because we live in an age when neither the military nor the economic aspects of national security can be considered in isolation. Our objective must be superior military strength and a strong economy; both are essential to our overall national security.

Effective SE/TD is still an essential part of system management. We have found that the best way to remove any question as to the complete objectivity and impartiality of the systems engineering/technical direction contractor is to assign the SE/TD function to a nonprofit, nonhardware producing organization. Furthermore, the use of the SE/TD contractor is selective. Where the technical complexity and the systems inte-

gration problems do not require unusual capability across the broad spectrum of scientific disciplines, we follow the more traditional methods of systems acquisition.

The challenges of the future will certainly call for further innovations to cope with the complex and demanding tasks ahead of us. These innovations are not to be feared, but welcomed. I do not believe that we shall ever reach a perfectly static set of management procedures, any more than we will ever prevent technology from moving ahead. Contrary to what some people may say, technology has not reached a "plateau." Actually it continues to move forward rapidly, and we must work to keep our technological leadership. We must maintain the technological superiority that is the key to national security. Our management practices must be geared to encourage this superiority.

This is the challenge facing all of us. It is clear that computer technology will make possible far-reaching changes in management. In only a few years it has already had a significant impact on the way we do business—both in the Government and in industry.

We must make sure, however, that the tail does not begin to wag the dog. The goal of management is not merely to evolve toward more complex and more involved methods of procedure. Its objective is not just some theoretical model of completeness and efficiency. Quite simply, its only aim is to get the job done—with speed, effectiveness, and economy. Furthermore, it must enable us to do the job within the framework of our democratic goals and values.

This is the principle which the Air Force has followed in its development of systems management. It has frequently led us to evolve new concepts, and we have not been afraid to depart from tradition. I think the results fully justify this approach, and I am certain that it will be required to meet the challenges of the future.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in a very short time, the President will have submitted proposed agricultural legislation for consideration by Congress.

Every year, I receive considerable mail, and a volume of [redacted] calls and telegrams, directed to questions or suggestions concerning farm programs—ranging from how to make them better to how to get rid of them entirely. I am certain that all Senators enjoy a similar experience.

I have been struck by certain facts and considerations that run through these letters, and which recur in meetings and discussions I hold with various groups and delegations. These are items, incidentally, that are evident each year when farm legislation is considered.

There is still a high level of misunderstanding between various segments of the urban and rural populations. It is not clearly recognized by all that their ties are close, that interrelationships are continuous and vital, and that even in this age of specialization each is wholly dependent upon the other.

These are not alien worlds. While certain facets of the daily mode of life may vary, both segments assume and carry responsibilities that would be meaningless without the other. The occupational skills and workload of the farm, urban or city dweller may be extremely different but each needs the expertise and help of the other to survive.

The efforts and output of each are inexpugnably entwined in the national welfare. A metropolitan and industrial nation, no matter how strong, could be reduced to a second-rate power, even a debtor nation, without a continuous and even flow of wholesome food supplies. A nation dominated by agricultural interests could only fail to reach its maximum capabilities in growth and outlook.

This Nation has been blessed with a strong and responsive agriculture, and with a viable industrial and business complex. The interests, activities, benefits, and burdens of each blend together.

Six million American workers are needed to supply the farmer with tools, machines, materials, and services for food and fiber production. Farmers bought $41 billion worth of goods and services in 1963—$29 billion for production supplies, and $12 billion for services.

Ten million workers transport, process, manufacture, and sell farm goods. In 1961, manufacturers of food products alone had 1.7 million employees and a payroll of $8.4 billion.

With ever-increasing efficiency, the American farmer now produces enough food for himself and 31 others. We spend only about 19 percent of our take-home pay for food. Britishers spend about 29 percent, Russians 40 percent or more.

Many a factory worker lives in a rural community or is a part-time farmer; many a farmowner lives in town or is a part-time factory worker. Many a farmer enters the business world when he retails his product, sets up his own processing operation, or becomes a stockholder in an allied industry. Many a city dweller has an interest in a family farm or is a gentleman farmer who receives the benefits of commodity and conservation programs.

Examples of the interrelation of rural and urban interests are many and varied. To deny an interdependence is to beg the issue. To misunderstand this fact brings forth criticism from urban interests that are not wholly merited by the farmer. It brings forth indignation from the farmer that should not be directed specifically to the city dweller.

One thing is certain, however: Without an abundance of food, and the means and services to move it to market, both rural and urban consumers would be paying high and premium prices for many a commodity, and a disastrous spiral of inflation would be started.

The second fact that emerges is that, as with no other segment of our economy, agriculture is the least equipped to bring its individual or cumulative production into line with demand so that farm income reflects an equitable return on investment. In no other segment of the economy is there less consensus on how to meet the problem.

Agriculture speaks with a babble of voices. Each commodity group seemingly considers itself a separate entity and evidences little consideration for the others—although their mutual aims are basically the same. Within each commodity group are the divergent interests of producers and the allied interests—the processors, manufacturers, mills, and what-have-you. Add to this a general distrust by geographical regions, and muddied waters only become darker.

Also, it is apparent that, all claims withstanding, no agricultural group or organization—and certainly no national farm association—speaks for agriculture.

Considerable criticism has been voiced about the complexities of commodity programs. The farmer in Indiana, who for the most part has diversified operations, is particularly sensitive on this point—and I suggest rightly so. But I suggest also that any legislation adopted by the Congress is mandated by the very condition it reflects. Until clear and simplified mandates are received from within agriculture, then the legislation that agriculture seeks can only meet the many and diverse claims that it makes.

A third point is that price support programs, initiated by the Congress in the public interest and for the national welfare, have been tarred by some with the black brush of handout to the point that this type of subsidy, if it is a true subsidy, has been distorted to a caricature of its basic meaning.

The concept and intent—in fact, the reality—of price-support operations is that of dollar and cent values placed upon eligible commodities which reflect a minimum fair value to the farmer only when, and if, he places that commodity under loan. Price-support programs do not guarantee a profit to any farmer.

The accumulation of commodity stocks by the Government that began to become burdensome and costly during the 1950's—and with certain commodities at the present time—can be attributed primarily to the aversion within agriculture to place restrictions upon yield. Of what value are general acreage restrictions when yields per acre for all the major commodities are annually surpassing previous records?

Be that as it may, the fact remains that those portions of farm programs that may be considered subsidy-type operations are not limited to agriculture in our economic system. They are unique only in that they are the most open to public scrutiny and the most susceptible to criticism.

I believe that it should be borne in mind, too, that commodity programs are not outright payments for mere services rendered. They are basically loan programs, in which a specified commodity is pledged as collateral. Takeover by the Government occurs when the loan is defaulted. Land diversion and retirement features of farm programs are predicated upon conservation principles which protect our national resources. All are designed to meet a definite need at minimal cost—not only for the farmer but also for all taxpayers.

For those individuals and groups interested in farm legislation, I would commend, and recommend the reading of "Farm Programs and Dynamic Forces in Agriculture," which was prepared by the Legislative Research Service of the Library of Congress and transmitted to the Committee on Agriculture and

Forestry, U.S. Senate. This document was ordered to be printed and appears under date of February 4, 1965, 89th Congress, 1st session.

I find it interesting to note in this detailed and objective report that, in the absence of price-support programs in the years 1961–65, net farm income would have declined by one-half, to about $6 billion a year. In addition to some $6 billion annual losses in farm income, farmers also would have experienced decreases of several billion dollars a year in farmland values—rather than the increases which occurred.

It is also interesting to note in connection with these observations that similar conclusions were reached by study groups of Iowa State University, Pennsylvania State University, and Oklahoma State University.

It is possibly true that, as charged, certain inequities may exist in present price-support legislation—that many benefits accrue to the larger operators, that the higher productive farm units use support programs as a hedge for their overproduction, and that the smallest farm units are not given sufficient legislative protection and incentive.

If these charges are true, then I believe that due consideration should be given to realining support mechanisms so that the national interest is served to the fullest.

The fourth point is that considerable interest has been created over proposed rural development programs and in connection with resource development programs. These are needed and long-awaited proposals. Many benefits have already been derived. Many added benefits will undoubtedly be forthcoming.

However, I suggest that, insofar as our basic concern is for a strong agriculture, we do not get the cart before the horse—and relegate the growing of crops to a mere contingency of rural affairs.

The reason for being of a farmer—large or small—is to grow a needed commodity at a profit which will assure an adequate and even flow of food and fiber to market, and at a fair price to the consumer.

A strong rural America, with an aggressive rural development, rests firmly on a sound and progressive onfarm economy.

The farmer needs to avail himself of all that is part and parcel of our high standard of living. Rural America needs to avail itself of all the advantages and incentives that are encompassed in the principles of the Great Society.

But a clear line of understanding must be maintained between those programs directed primarily at increasing the purchasing power, and the bargaining power, of the farmer and those designed solely to supplement these programs, or as vehicles to aid those farmers forced off the land for want of income.

A fifth point is that I find it paradoxical and tragic that the Department of Agriculture should become the whipping post for so much undue criticism. As the saying goes, "It is flayed if it does, and peeled if it does not."

I make the point that many harsh evaluations of the Department are due to misunderstandings of its role and function.

Perhaps no other department of Government administers so many programs that affect consumers. Certainly, this Department is second to none in its day-to-day concern and efforts to protect and to further the national interests.

A sixth and final point is that the value of agriculture has been downgraded and the image of agriculture has become blurred. I am afraid that much of the fault lies within agriculture itself.

Many within agriculture are now voicing concern that changing population trends, the growth of metropolitan areas, and the increased representation from urban areas will have an adverse effect on agricultural legislation. There is concern that the voice of rural America will be lost in the hurly-burly sounds of megalopolis and that the votes will be cast only on the basis of urban interests versus rural need.

I suggest that this is a false and short-sighted view. I have not supported all farm legislation proposed, but it was not because those city people I represent recommended that the farmer be written off the books.

Whether or not farm legislation as presented this year is acceptable to the majority of the Senate remains to be seen. It will be neither accepted nor voted down, however, on the simple basis of rural vote against urban vote. It will be considered on its merits, and on the basis of fact, need, and feasibility as presently known.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

EXPORT SALES OF CATTLE TO ITALY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a short time ago Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, in television comments, spoke about the cattle industry. The substance of it was that the Secretary of Agriculture is about to deprive the United States of what had been building into a lucrative cattle export business, at a time when this country is desperately in need of increased overseas trade.

The problem is that the cattle must have health certificates, and as Mr. McCaffrey points out:

The health certificate now provided by the Department of Agriculture contains spaces for 16 head of cattle on a single sheet of paper. When a shipment of 500 heifers or cows is exported to Italy, they may be sold to as many as 500 individual buyers. Each cow must have a certificate to accompany it. If the health certificate has 16 head of cattle on it, it makes it extremely difficult to complete the resale in Italy. In fact, at times some of the sales have fallen through in Italy because of the inability of the broker to provide the proper health certificates for an individual cow.

Mr. President, this is merely a question of administration. Italian buyers have asked—even pleaded and said they would pay the cost of printing the individual certificates—and yet all of their urging is to no avail because Washington smugness and bureaucracy keeps them from furnishing a certificate for each head of cattle which would go into Italy.

Under date of March 17, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture asking about this problem. As yet I have heard nothing from him on the subject, either by way of explanation or as to whether a correction will be made.

In this day when we are so concerned about the price of our livestock and the sale of livestock, and when many times it has been said on the floor of the Senate and other places that we have an overpopulation of cattle, that we have too many cattle in this country, and that fact leads to depressed prices, it seems rather paradoxical that we could not get a reconsideration of this matter, which is merely administrative, in the Department of Agriculture, in order that we might continue the export of our cattle and other livestock to Italy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. McCaffrey's remarks together with a copy of the letter I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture on March 17 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TELEVISION COMMENTS OF JOSEPH MCCAFFREY

A government worker becomes a bureaucrat when he becomes inflexible.

This inflexibility, which is setting in with Agriculture Secretary Freeman, is about to deprive the United States of what had been building into a lucrative cattle export business. And at a time when this country is desperately in need of increased oversea trade.

Italian buyers have been buying cattle along the east coast and shipping them back home. But because of the inflexibility of the Department of Agriculture, the buyers are about to transfer their activity to Canada.

This is the problem. The cattle must have health certificates. The health certificates now provided by the Department of Agriculture contain spaces for 16 head of cattle on a single sheet of paper.

When a shipment of 500 heifers or cows is exported to Italy, they may be sold to as many as 500 individual buyers. Each cow must have a certificate to accompany it. If the health certificate has 16 head of cattle on it, it makes it extremely difficult to complete the resale in Italy. In fact, at times, some of the sales have fallen through in Italy because of the inability of the broker to provide the proper health certificates for an individual cow.

The Italian buyers have pleaded; they have even said they will pay the cost of printing the individual certificates.

All to no avail. Washington smugly tells them it is impossible; that one cow cannot be listed on one piece of paper.

President Johnson, instead of curtailing the travel of schoolteachers in Europe this summer, might help the balance of payments if he talked to the Department of Agriculture.

Canada, by the way, has told the Italian shippers they are willing and eager to supply one certificate for each animal.

MARCH 17, 1965.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On a newscast last night, I heard a report that the United States has lost, or is about to lose, a sizable amount of export sales of cattle which have been going to Italy. The report says that the Italian buyers have commenced negotiations with Canadian exporters.

The particulars, as explained on the newscast, are that the Italian buyers are in a cooperative purchase arrangement, so that one individual purchaser may receive only one or two animals, although the cattle were shipped in lots of 100 or more. Many of the cattle are resold in Italy by the buyer, and a USDA inspection report is required for the resale. For that reason, the buyers would prefer that only one animal be listed on the USDA form used for inspection of export cattle. However, the USDA form has space to list 16 head. The Agriculture Department personnel concerned with the inspection took the position that they absolutely could not issue individual inspection reports, but that 16 animals had to be listed where there were 16 spaces on the form. Result: the Italians are going to purchase the cattle they want from Canada rather than from us.

I would appreciate having from you a detailed explanation of the situation described and confirmation or denial of the allegation that the Italian purchasers have turned to Canada for their further purchases. The report is almost incredible, particularly in view of the efforts by our cattle producers to increase exports, and I would like to have your side of the story.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. GORE. 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 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously enterd, until Monday, March 29, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 24, 1965:

IN THE ARMY

The following officer, presently on the temporary disability retired list, for reappointment to the active list, as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as temporary major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 1211, 3442, and 3447:

Maj. Gen. Hobart Hewett, [redacted], U.S. Army.

IN THE NAVY

Rear. Adm. Edward E. Grimm, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 25, 1965:

THE JUDICIARY

The following-named persons to be Assistant Attorneys General:

Fred Moore Vinson, Jr., of Maryland.
Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., of New York.

Lawrence Gubow, of Michigan, to be U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 16, 1965.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

John G. Adams, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1970.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1964, vice Frederick W. Ford, resigned.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Carl E. Bagge, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1967, vice Harold C. Woodward, deceased.

Charles Robert Ross, of Vermont, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1969. (Reappointment.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be captains

John C. Phillips
Robert C. Darling
Miller J. Tonkel

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

John L. Sweeney, of Michigan, to be Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Sam Zagoria, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1969, vice Boyd Leedom, term expired.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Stanley R. Resor, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice Paul R. Ignatius, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Bernard F. Roeder, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Right Reverend Protopresbyter, Nikolaj Lapitzki, Whiteruthenian (Byelorussian) Greek-Orthodox Church of St. Euphrosynia, South River, N.J., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

All generous God, the source of justice, on this day commemorating the anniversary of independence of Byelorussia, we humbly bow our heads and pray that Byelorussia and all other captive nations may soon receive a new birth of freedom.

Almighty God, the source of kindness, bless and instruct the leaders and legislators of the United States of America, so that they would arrive at the decisions which would lead to peace and freedom for all mankind.

O, Almighty God, the source of love, shorten the days of misunderstanding among nations, and give peace and your blessings to all the people on the earth. Thou art the Saviour and Protector, and we glorify Thy name today and shall forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On March 24, 1965:

H.R. 45. An act to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

RECEPTION FOR ASTRONAUTS GRISSOM AND YOUNG

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Speaker, I wish to extend to all Members an invitation to attend a reception in the caucus room of the Cannon Office Building tomorrow afternoon at 5 o'clock, for the two astronauts who have just so successfully flown through outer space.

The two astronauts, Virgil Grissom and John Young, will be there.

Unfortunately, we must limit the invitation to Members of the Congress and their immediate families. Consequently, we cannot allow the members of the congressional staffs to attend because there are so many people who want to see the astronauts that I am afraid Members of Congress would not have that opportunity.

I urge you to be present. I know there will be business on the floor but we are going to try to arrange it so that we can get off the floor in time to see these men who have made such a great contribution to space science and to the honor and dignity of our country.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I am not sure that my question should be directed to the gentleman—maybe it should be directed to the Speaker—but for the benefit of Members who are interested, do I correctly understand that there will also be a joint meeting of the Congress?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Mr. COLMER. I read that in the press.

Mr. MILLER. No, there will not be a joint meeting.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. YOUNG. We all agree that the American space achievements in the last few days have been nothing short of fantastic. We know a great many contributions have gone into the entire space effort. We know the great contribution that has been made by the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House and its great chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California.

FILING OF REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1966

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1966.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL reserved all points of order on the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 48]

Ashbrook	Everett	Jones, Ala.
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Jones, Mo.
Brock	Green, Oreg.	Martin, Ala.
Clark	Hébert	Toll
Dent	Howard	Tupper
Dickinson	Hull	Widnall

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 414 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

REORGANIZATION OF BUREAU OF CUSTOMS, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 125)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

All that we do to serve the people of this land must be done, as has been my insistent pledge, with the least cost and the most effectiveness.

In my state of the Union, I announced it was this administration's intention to "reshape and reorganize" the executive branch. This goal had one objective: "to meet more effectively the tasks of today."

I report today now one step taken forward toward that goal as part of our progress "on new economies we were planning to make."

I submit today a plan for reorganization in the Bureau of Customs of the Department of the Treasury.

At present the Bureau maintains 113 independent field offices, each reporting directly to Customs headquarters in Washington, D.C. Under a modernization program of which this reorganization plan is an integral part, the Secretary of the Treasury proposes to establish six regional offices to supervise all Customs field activities. The tightened management controls achieved from these improvements will make possible a net annual saving of $9 million within a few years.

An essential feature will be the abolition of the offices of all Presidential appointees in the Customs Service. The program cannot be effectively carried out without this step.

The following offices, therefore, would be eliminated: collectors of customs, comptrollers of customs, surveyors of customs, and appraisers of merchandise, to which appointments are now required to be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Incumbents of abolished offices will be given consideration for suitable employment under the civil service laws in any positions in Customs for which they may be qualified.

When this reorganization is completed, all official and employees of the Bureau of Customs will be appointed under the civil service laws.

All of the functions of the offices which will be abolished are presently vested in the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 which gives the Secretary power to redelegate these functions. He will exercise this power as the existing offices are abolished.

The estimate of savings that will be achieved by the program of Customs modernization and improvement, of which this reorganization plan is a part, is based on present enforcement levels, business volume, and salary scales. Of the amounts saved, approximately $1 million a year will be from salaries no longer paid because of the abolition of offices.

The proposed new organizational framework looks to the establishment of new offices at both headquarters and field levels and abolition of present offices.

This result in a net reduction of more than 50 separate principal field offices by concentration of supervisory responsibilities in fewer officials in charge of regional and district activities. In addition to the 6 offices of Regional Commissioner, about 25 offices of District Director will be established. The Regional Commissioners and District Directors will asume the overall principal supervisory responsibilities and functions of collectors of customs, appraisers of merchandise, comptrollers of customs, laboratories, and supervising customs agents.

At the headquarters level, four new offices will be established to replace seven divisions. A new position of Special Assistant to the Commissioner will be created and charged with responsibility for insuring that all Customs employees conduct themselves in strict compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. Up to now this function has been one of a number lodged with an existing division.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

It should be emphasized that abolition by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 of the offices of collector of customs, comptroller of customs, surveyor of customs, and appraiser of merchandise will in no way prejudice any right of any person affected by the laws administered by the Bureau of Customs. The rights of importers and others, for example, before the Customs Court, arising out of the administration of such functions will remain unaffected. In addition it should be emphasized that all essential services to the importing, exporting, and traveling public will continue to be performed.

This reorganization plan will permit a needed modernization of the organization and procedure of the Bureau of Customs. It will permit a more effective administration of the customs laws.

I urge the Congress to permit Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1965.*

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2362, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2362, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] had 1 hour and 4 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] had 1 hour and 11 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, we are faced again with an urgent appeal to provide broad-scale Federal aid to education. Once again the pleas are heard that if massive Federal aid is not provided our school systems will be unable to meet the coming needs, and our Nation will suffer from an increasing educational lag.

Mr. Chairman, there are many of us who have heard this cry raised repeatedly in previous years. I remember that the demand for Federal aid to education reached its peak in the mid-1950's. At that time we were told that the school population would rapidly increase as a result of the postwar baby boom and if Federal aid was not provided our State and local governments would be unable to meet this need. Anyone who does not recall the urgent tone of those appeals and the dire threats which were made can quickly return to the congressional hearings and debates of 10 years ago and see what I mean.

A majority of the Congress remained unconvinced and the Federal aid programs proposed at that time were never enacted. It is important to ask, "What has happened to our public schools in the past decade?"

The record of the 10 years between 1954 and 1964 reveal a truly remarkable progress in the field of education. To meet rapidly exploding needs the forces of our educational and governmental units throughout the land responded with great vigor and responsibility.

True to the estimates of that time, public school enrollments increased by 42.8 percent during this decade. To accommodate these millions of new students the number of classrooms rose 57.6, percent thus permitting a reduction in the average number of pupils per classroom from 30.5 to 27.6.

During the same period the total teaching staff increased 55.4 percent thus allowing a reduction in the number of pupils per teacher from 26.0 to 23.9.

Financing these tremendous increases in school plant and operating expenditures was not easy, but it was accomplished upon the initiative of parents and taxpayers throughout the land. Total public elementary and secondary school expenditures increased by 134.5 percent. The current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance increased by 50 percent.

This was not done at the sacrifice of teachers' salaries for they were increased by 61 percent.

I would like to point out that in each of these indexes of school need and performance the increase in percentage terms has been much greater than the 42.8-percent increase in enrollment.

I do not deny that the problems were great, but the excellent performance of our schools in meeting the needs demonstrates that it can be done without Federal aid.

The projected increase for the next 10 years is only 15.2 percent. Surely if we met the 42.8-percent increase in the last decade we need hardly believe that the needs of the next 10 years are of a critical nature or by themselves justify massive Federal aid.

Once again the proposals for Federal aid seek to give the most to those areas which have done the least to help themselves in meeting school needs.

The proposed Federal aid to education bill is to the distinct disadvantage of Indiana. Indiana's citizens have been paying high taxes to build and support their schools for many years, and that is as it should be. However, in recent years Indiana has been losing a great deal of industry with payrolls amounting to millions of dollars to States which pay less taxes than we do. These States have been using their low tax rate as a bait to entice industry away from Indiana, and I regret to say that this has been successful.

Thirty-five States in the Union will receive higher benefits per capita under this bill than will Indiana. Allow me to point out a few examples: Indiana will receive $4.89 per capita under this bill: Alabama will receive $10.42 per capita and Mississippi $13.28. This will only encourage and help these States in their drive to get Indiana industry to move to their State, enabling them to keep their tax rates low by giving them a Federal subsidy.

Yes, Indiana will get $23 million under this bill, but Hoosiers will pay far more than that in taxes to benefit other States.

Why does not this bill give to each State the same assistance per capita or give to each State a percentage of the Federal taxes paid in that State? The reason this is not done is that there would be no Federal bureaucracy to determine which area is to receive money and which area is not.

The heavy revenue demands of the Federal Government do leave little opportunity for State and local governments to raise the revenue they require. For this reason I have for several years supported legislation which would require the Federal Government to turn back to each State the Federal cigarette tax collected from the residents of that State.

Under this proposal Indiana would receive far more money and there would be no Federal bureau to dominate education in Indiana.

The Federal Government now collects an 8-cent tax on each package of cigarettes sold. Such money could be returned to each State, earmarked for use in the field of education. The process would be similar to the tax money collected by a county treasurer who in turn distributed the tax money to the local school districts.

Each State then could distribute this money to the various school districts on a fair and equitable formula. Different States have different educational problems and could fairly distribute such funds in a manner that would meet the specific needs and desires of the citizens of that State.

This Federal cigarette tax amounts to approximately $2 billion per year. Indiana would receive approximately $50 million per year from this cigarette tax money, which is the amount Hoosiers pay in Federal cigarette taxes—no more, no less.

The plans that have been presented for "Federal aid" to education have run into many difficulties. These proposals carry with them obnoxious controls and overburdening cost for supervising and "snoopervising" that many of us cannot tolerate.

I want to point out that the tax plan which I suggest is the fairest, most equitable means by which we can make it possible to augment local taxes.

If we are interested in running our own schools and receiving back from the Federal Government for schools the money we pay, the legislation which I propose will do the job.

This approach to Federal aid was endorsed earlier this month in a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Governors' conference. This group of State Governors asked for a proportionate return of Federal tax revenues to State governments to enable State governments to accept more responsibility in providing needed services for their citizenry and to decrease the alarming trend toward complete Federal domination. Although the Governors' proposal was of a general nature, my specific proposal relating to cigarette tax funds designated for educational use is in line with their suggestion.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure to provide Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools. As I stated in a public release on March 11, I support the intent and purpose of this legislation for several reasons.

The educational needs of our children must be met. There is sufficient evidence that our States and local governments need assistance from the Federal Government in order to meet these needs.

I am convinced, as a lawyer and as a former attorney general of my State of Vermont, that sufficient safeguards are written into this legislation to keep controls of our education system at the State and local level and with public agencies.

From a practical standpoint, this proposal is the only general aid to education bill presented over these many years with a real chance of passage by the House of Representatives.

For those who are unalterably opposed to any type of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, I cannot make any appeal.

But to those who have recently and over the years come to the conclusion that our local and State governments

truly need financial assistance in providing better education to our children, let me say this.

As a former Governor, I have struggled with the problem of meeting these costs. Our State and local governments have had to cut corners on educational costs and even defer programs they knew should be offered to these children. The ability to raise taxes to meet these mounting costs on the State and local level is severely limited, and it is highly questionable that reducing the tax burden on the Federal level would result in making the job of raising taxes on the local and State levels any easier at all.

If this program helps the States to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children, it will help the educational standards for all our children. I am convinced that it will do this.

Some of you may want to wait for the "perfect" bill which would give Federal aid to education. While you are waiting for this "never-never legislation," our children will continue to receive inadequate educational instruction because, like it or not, our States need and want financial help.

For my own part, I am ready to get on with the task we face in education by supporting this measure now at hand.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, as many Members know, I voted to report the bill from the committee. I did so with a certain amount of reservation, however. I do not consider this bill perfect in all regards by any manner or means, nor do I believe that there has been any bill which has passed this House which has been perfect in all regards, by any manner of means.

I believe there is some room for improvement, and I am hopeful that the majority on the other side of the aisle will accept some constructive amendments.

I believe, however, that the pattern of our Nation's development at this point has created a need for additional Federal assistance, particularly in deprived areas, to education at the State and local levels in elementary and secondary schools.

My home State of California is unique in many ways. However, as the most populous State, it faces most of the educational problems common to all States.

I hope you will bear with me as I discuss some of our problems in California, particularly those related to other States and to population growth.

California's population today is 18 million. In 15 years it will reach 27 million—1 million children are added to our school system every 4 years.

The implications of such a growth are overwhelming of course. Particularly when it is related to the administration of a State educational system. These are implications not only for California, but for the entire Nation.

By 1975 another 10 million children between the ages of 5 and 17 will swell the already crushing numbers enrolled in our elementary and secondary school systems.

How then, is California coping with its share of the problem? And California is doing a great deal more than many other States in this regard, but I must admit it is still not doing well enough.

California presently has the fourth most crowded classrooms among all States. There is an average of 33 youngsters in every classroom. And it should be noted that this is the case in spite of the fact that 72,000 of our children attend school on a part-time basis.

And in spite of the fact that California has spent $1.5 billion in State funds for construction aid to school districts.

This outlay obviously has not kept up with the need for about 5,000 additional classrooms per year. Not to mention the elimination of presently inadequate and unsafe facilities.

Simply to reduce the average number of pupils per classroom by 1, from 33 to 32, would cost $100 million and an additional $78 million per year for salaries and operating costs. The cost of education is stifling.

But it must be remembered that education is only a portion of the demand that is placed on the State and local budgets each year. Competing for the tax dollar in every State are pressing needs of health, employment, sanitation, transportation and a myriad of other equally necessary social services. Reflecting such demands are the following facts:

Between 1954 and 1963 per capita municipal tax revenues increased by 43 percent in the United States. Local government indebtedness increased by 119 percent.

In California, property tax revenues have increased nearly five times since the end of World War II, far outrunning the rise of its personal income.

The increase in this source of revenue has been nearly twice as fast in California as in the United States. There are indications that the upper limit is being approached. Taxpayers are becoming increasingly reluctant to pay.

This is especially true among the elderly whose incomes are fixed and who make up 10 percent of the California population. A measure of this reluctance is indicated by the increasing incidence of property tax delinquency.

Since 1952, the Statewide delinquency of due taxes has more than tripled while the total property tax charge has doubled. These facts coupled with my own personal knowledge of great taxpayer unrest in the Los Angeles area, indicate the gravity of the problem. So concerned has the California Legislature become that last year it carried out an exhaustive study of the entire tax structure.

[redacted]-page report was devoted to property taxes. It must be said, however, that California has certainly tried to meet its responsibility to education. Realizing the basic educational need, California voters approved 75 percent of the total dollar amount of bond issues proposed for the construction of school facilities since 1954.

In 1963, approval was given to $330 million new school bond issues throughout the State, the largest dollar amount approved in the period since 1954.

The presently overcrowded classrooms give testimony to the fact that these efforts have not been sufficient. The city of Los Angeles presents a typical picture of the pattern of debt and demand. Including all local taxes, Los Angeles citizens paid $8.72 per hundred dollars value in 1964. Out of the $8.72, $3.91 was spent on education. A quick glance at the statistics indicates why.

Los Angeles is the second largest school system in the Nation with a total of 491,000 elementary and secondary school pupils—30,000 new pupils are added each year. A closer look shows that the downtown area—the major target of this legislation—is most in need—12,000 pupils are concentrated in five high schools as compared with 9,000 in the 9 suburban high schools.

The concentrated need is further reflected by a comparison of the pupil dropout figures for the two areas. The downtown high schools had a dropout rate of from 21.6 to 17.3 percent of pupil enrollment. The suburban group showed a rate ranging from 1 to 3.7 percent of pupil enrollment. The conclusion is obvious.

The schools in which children need education the most have the largest overenrollment. The schools with the most need are losing approximately one out of five pupils before graduation via the dropout. The facts are clear. The statistics are ominous.

We are here today in an effort to stem the tide that threatens our State educational systems.

Title I would make $1 billion available to low-income school districts on the basis of one-half the average expenditure per pupil in the State multiplied by the number of children aged 5 to 17 whose families have less than $2,000 income per year and the number of children aged 5 to 17 from families whose incomes from aid to families with dependent children are $2,000 or more. This formula appears to provide the most practical remedy to the very problems that I have outlined.

The impacted urban areas with critically limited resources are directly rifled in upon. In California, there are 227,000 children aged 5 to 17 in families with less than $2,000 income per year. There are over 153,000 children aged 5 to 17 from 46,000 families receiving more than $2,000 aid under the dependent children provisions of the Social Security Act. A great portion of this assistance would go to school districts within the cities.

We therefore have a program in which the solution relates directly to the need. I would like now to address my remarks, with particular emphasis, to the Republican side of the aisle.

As a Republican, it is my firm belief that we have before us a program that is deserving of our reasoned support. A program with which our party could find itself closely associated. We are faced today with critical national prob-

lems inherent in educationally deprived people.

They are translated in terms of high school dropout rates, high draft rejection rates, hard-core unemployment, and the presence of 8 million American adults who do not have a fifth grade education.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, the result is economic poverty and it cannot be separated from educational poverty.

Since the inception of the present administration's war on poverty our party has been charged with a lack of concern for the poor of the Nation.

These charges stem from a sound opposition, I believe, to most of the make-work proposals that have thus far been presented to us. I shared that opposition to such programs, as you may know. I have also voted against such programs as the Antipoverty Act, Appalachia, and many others. But I sincerely believe that we have an opportunity today to strike a blow at what we all know to be the root of poverty, educational deprivation.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans have been accused of being against everything. I do not think that is true. But I certainly do not want to be a part of being opposed and being considered to be opposed to education. Education is an area in which we strike poverty right on the head. Education is really the answer to the problem, with respect to the state of our poverty today.

Mr. Chairman, years ago, as a boy, I was taught that the strength of a nation lay in her natural resources such as coal, iron, steel production, and agricultural production from which she could build economic and military leadership. We have now conquered the basic needs of our Nation and far different challenges are presented to us, challenges that call for far different results, educated people.

Mr. Chairman, the success of yesterday's Gemini flight was a challenge to our educational resource.

Mr. Chairman, automation is another challenge. Does anyone seem to think here that an educational program is not going to help us fight the problem of automation when in 1970 we will have 22 million new young people in the labor market looking for jobs?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, also rising crime rates represent another factor. Does anyone think that education is not going to be helpful in working toward the ending of high crime rate as well as critical high school dropout rates, or hard-core unemployment?

Mr. Chairman, these modern-day challenges will only be met with a firm dedication to education.

As with any program of this magnitude, there are certain weaknesses. But there should be a specific elimination of them rather than a total rejection of the legislation. Certainly, we can pick out parts of this legislation and say, perhaps, some changes should be made. But I believe we should keep our eye on this point which is the advantage to the Republican Party in espousing this legislation, and thus being able to say this is our method of fighting poverty .

Mr. Chairman, the brunt of the measure is aimed to provide incentive for what has become the most fundamental resource of our Nation today, education.

We have the responsibility of insuring its success.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], on what I feel was a very fine address to this House.

Mr. Chairman, I take great pride in joining my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee in enthusiastic support of H.R. 2362, a bill to assist the elementary and secondary schools of our Nation. This is yet another brick in the building of President Johnson's "Great Society." Indeed, it represents one of the most vital bricks. It has been apparent for some time that there is a direct relationship between conditions of poverty and lack of educational development and poor academic performance.

California, and particularly Los Angeles, will gain much needed Federal assistance through this bill. I am pleased to note that the committee accepted the Roosevelt amendment requiring the use of data recognizing the inmigration to California of approximately 225,000 school-age children per year; as well as the amendment which adds to the basic formula the number of school-age children in families receiving welfare assistance where such assistance results in income above the basic $2,000 test due to the large number of children in such families. The latter adds approximately $13 million to California's share of title I funds, and will mean approximately $3,700,000 additional funds for the Los Angeles area—funds which are badly needed for the relief of our hard-pressed property taxpayers.

After the additions noted above, the grand total for Los Angeles County is $31 million—of which the city of Los Angeles will receive approximately $25 million.

Other titles of the bill provide: $100 million for State agencies for the purchase of school library resources, library materials and textbooks, which will be available on an equitable basis to all elementary and secondary school children and teachers; $100 million for the establishment by local educational agencies of supplemental educational centers within the community to provide special educational services, which otherwise would not be available to all children in the area; remaining funds to be used to expand educational research under the Cooperative Research Act of 1954; and to strengthen State educational agencies.

Testimony presented to the committee illustrated sharply and starkly that the conditions of poverty or economic deprivation produce an environment which in too many cases precludes children from taking full advantage of the educational facilities provided. There was virtually unanimous agreement that aid to the economically disadvantaged child represented the basic approach to widespread educational improvement in this country.

When this body considered and passed the President's Economic Opportunity Act, it was clear that the major, long-term weapon in the war against poverty must be education. Under title I of this legislation, the schools can become a potent instrument for breaking the poverty cycle by providing full educational opportunity to every child, regardless of economic background.

The bill's major thrust is found in title I, which would provide $1.06 billion to local school districts to improve public school programs in schools where there are concentrations of children from low-income families, or from families receiving welfare payments.

Some broadening of public school programs and services in which nonpublic school children may participate is expected. Programs will be broadened to the extent there are poverty-stricken children in nonpublic schools. The local educational agency will maintain administrative supervision and control of all programs and all funds. The bill does not authorize any grant for any service to a private institution. It does not authorize payment of private school teachers' salaries; it does not authorize private school construction; it does not authorize purchase of equipment or materials for private schools.

Let me make it absolutely clear that the committee has consulted with eminent constitutional experts so as to draft language which does no violence to the constitutional provisions for separation of church and state. These experts agree that the language of the bill avoids the church-state issue.

Mr. Chairman, I completely support this bill and hope that it will be speedily passed.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this legislation because I believe it is long, long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, I speak today with the realization that we have before us a matter upon which the foundations of our system of free, democratic government rests—education. Without adequate education for every member of our society, democracy is critically weakened; for it is only a knowledgeable mind that can make truly free choices, and it is only an educated man that can truly avail himself of the equal opportunity our way of life promises to provide.

I have in the past watched with regret as bill after bill in this area has failed to solve the complexities of the problem and has consequently disappeared in the legislative mill. The task of improving our school systems is an immense one and no one legislative proposal can hope to do the whole job, but the time has come when we must act. Education is desperately in need of aid and some forceful measures must be taken which answer the needs without compromising the principles of the Constitution. I come here in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 because I believe that it does this.

Some may argue, as they have in the past, that there is no need for Federal aid to education, that the States and localities can cope with the problem unassisted. One need only look at a few pertinent statistics to see how unrealistic such a view is. Within the last two decades, State and local bonded indebtedness has risen approximately 450 percent, compared with a 14-percent increase in the Federal debt. In that same period, State and local taxes have increased about 340 percent, while Federal taxes rose only 140 percent. Many States and localities simply cannot meet the enormous tax increases that would be necessary to implement a program of quality education. Therefore, I say there is a need for Federal aid, a burning need, a need we must meet.

The proposed legislation was a good bill as originally drawn; it is a better bill as amended in committee. A basic purpose of the bill is, as the President said in his education message, to "bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most"—to improve education in those poverty stricken areas where it has long been substandard. I believe the bill as reported would carry out this purpose admirably. The effect of the legislation on my home State of New York may serve as an example.

New York ranks first in the Union in average per pupil educational expenditures. But it also has a very large number of school-age children from economically deprived families. Consequently, while some students are afforded the best quality education presently available, many others, especially in the Nation's largest city, attend woefully inadequate schools. Under the allotment formula in title I of the act as originally drawn, New York would have been eligible for approximately $75 million in grants for use in economically deprived areas. The original formula provided grants on the basis of the number of school-age children from families with income less than $2,000 per year. The committee realized, however, that this formula did not take into account another sizable body of indigent children, largely from families whose income exceeds $2,000 only because they receive aid for dependent children. The committee wisely amended title I to include these children in the formula for determining grants. As a result, the amount of grants to New York will be increased by approximately $16.7 million. It should be noted that this increase is not to be subtracted from the proposed grant to any other State, but will be made available from additional appropriations. It is also important that in the bill as reported, Congress, not the Commissioner of Education, will establish by law the formula to be used in determining grants for the second and third years of the program.

In the past, any mention of aid to nonpublic schools has raised the question of constitutionality. I, myself, have been very concerned with this question in that I believe it is of the utmost importance that we maintain those basic religious and political freedoms that the Constitution has outlined. But it has often been this very issue that has defeated so many aid proposals in the past. Realizing that aid is needed more desperately than ever, the President and the Congress sought a means by which they could walk the narrow line between the Constitution and its violation, and come up with a meaningful assistance program. It was finally determined that aid could be given to the underprivileged child attending a nonpublic school by giving the aid to the child rather than to the school. Admittedly, this demands a broad interpretation of the Constitution, but I believe it is to the credit of Congress and the President that such a workable interpretation has at last been found and that we can now end our dubious heritage of inaction in this field.

Even before the present bill was formally drafted, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare solicited the opinion of the Office of the Attorney General as to the constitutionality of the proposed measures. The Attorney General's Office held that the measures were Constitutional, ending its statement in these words:

> Accordingly, we conclude, and remain of the view, that the first amendment is not a bar to carrying out the provisions of the bill.

Still, the committee made several changes in the language of the bill to make its constitutional basis doubly sure. For example, under title I, pupils in private schools are entitled to a proportionate share of the grant to the local public educational agency. But the committee has amended section 205 of title I to state explicitly that funds provided under this title must be controlled by a public agency; that title to any property derived from such funds must remain in a public agency; and that a public agency must administer such funds and properties. Similarly, title II was amended by the committee to assure that books and other learning resources will be made available to private school pupils only on a loan basis, and that a public educational agency will retain title and administrative control over such materials. Thus, the proposal assures that assistance will be rendered students without in any way enriching the private institutions which they attend.

Certainly, this aspect of the bill is difficult, but that is because the situation which it attempts to cover is difficult. I believe, and have been informed by knowledgeable sources, that the bill is constitutionally correct. With this belief, I feel that what is most important is that we get on with the problem before us. There are grave inadequacies in our educational system, and we have a bill which will take important steps toward correcting this situation. At worst, it is a calculated risk that can be corrected by the courts if in error. At best, it can offer hope for those millions of Americans who would otherwise be the victims of inferior schooling.

I have stated that there is no cure-all for the educational ills of our country. But I see the present proposals as an initial treatment in what, through perseverance and foresight, can result in a complete, if not rapid, cure. Briefly then, how will the proposed legislation move to effect that cure?

Well aware of the relationship between poverty and low educational achievement, it will pump funds into areas in which children from low-income families are concentrated, with the aim of meeting in a variety of ways the specific needs of these educationally deprived children.

Realizing, even in this age with its stress on the laboratory, that the printed word is still the foundation upon which education is built, it will provide funds for library resources, textbooks, and other learning materials for areas which are presently deficient in them.

It will aid the local educational agencies in establishing supplementary centers at which educational and cultural opportunities presently unavailable in the local schools will be offered, and through which universities, museums, State educational agencies, and individuals accomplished in the arts and sciences can share their knowledge with our youth.

It will authorize grants to institutions, organizations, and individuals for the furtherance of educational research and development, and for the dissemination and implementation of the results of such programs.

And finally, it will help the State educational agencies to strengthen their potential for leadership and to isolate and provide for the educational needs within the States.

I repeat my belief that education is the keystone to maintaining the democratic principles of our Government and to providing a better way of life for all our citizens. In my 33 years of continuous public service, I have never voted against an education bill. With the obvious needs that are before us now, I feel this is no time for me to change my position. I wholeheartedly support the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and urge its quick passage.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN.]

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362 and urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, no task before our Nation is more important than improving

and expanding the educational opportunities of all our people.

Education is the foundation of our democratic society. It is the key ingredient in our economic and social progress. Yet today thousands of young people are not receiving its benefits and thousands more are not being educated to their maximum capacity.

The relationship between high educational and high economic attainment, and the relationship between poor education and poverty, has been clearly and significantly demonstrated.

During the last 10 years jobs for high school graduates have increased by 40 percent, while jobs for those who failed to enter or complete high school dropped by 10 percent.

Unemployment of young people with an eighth grade education or less is 4 times the national average, yet nearly 1 million continue to quit school each year.

The lack of adequate education is one of the major factors in our present high rates of youth unemployment, delinquency, and crime.

Failure to improve our educational performance is therefore, as President Kennedy so aptly stated 2 years ago, "Not only poor social policy, but poor economics."

Mr. Chairman, this bill before us today does not, of course, meet all of our educational needs. It does not, for example, afford enough resources for needed new school construction, or for necessary teacher recruitment, or for overdue improvement in teachers' salaries.

But it is a beginning. It is a national program for a national problem.

It correctly recognizes that poverty has perpetuated itself; that it has been viciously passed from one generation to another at the very time that most Americans have been enjoying the greatest affluence of our history. It recognizes that this cycle must be broken, and it wisely moves to this task by giving financial assistance and a better opportunity to those children and to those communities who need it most.

A second-rate system of education is no more tolerable than a second-rate system of defense. We can and we must do better, for at stake is the future of our children and our country.

I urge that this bill be passed as a beginning to the vital task at hand.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished member of the subcommittee who worked so hard on this legislation, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss one of the most important titles in the bill, title V. This title is designed to strengthen our decentralized system of education in the United States, and improve State leadership and service for the elementary and secondary education programs in each of the States.

One of the most effective means of improving educational programs at the elementary and secondary levels in our Nation is to improve and strengthen the State educational agencies that are responsible for supervising and directing State systems of education. In short, to strengthen State departments of education.

In 1962–63, State departments of education distributed to local school districts $8 billion of State funds to supplement more than $11 billion of local funds. They also served as the administrative agencies for the States in conducting activities receiving $700 million of Federal funds. This bill will raise the amount of State administered Federal funds to $2 billion. State departments of education also have a massive responsibility under State laws for regulating the operation of the institutions in State systems, of education, and for providing the statewide leadership essential to continuing educational progress, and improving the quality of education.

At a consequence of the burgeoning needs in education, few if any State departments of education have sufficient resources to perform the work now expected of them. Frankly, many of our State departments of education are so understaffed that they are unable to do properly even the ministerial duties assigned to them by law. The leadership services that should be provided by these departments to local school districts are increasingly inadequate.

It has been estimated that in the past 5 years there has been a 40-percent turnover in State supervisory personnel. A majority have gone into better paying positions at the local level and at colleges and universities. For the legislation proposed in this bill to achieve optimum results, it is imperative that the leadership resources of our State departments of education be strengthened considerably.

This bill in its entire approach puts maximum emphasis on the role of State departments of education.

One of the many chief State school officers who testified before our subcommittee was Dr. Lynn Bartlett, superintendent of public instruction for the State of Michigan. An experienced leader among school officers, Dr. Bartlett said:

> As I read the President's message on education, and as I have carefully gone over the Education Act in preparation for this hearing, I could not help but be impressed with the many new and additional responsibilities a State department of education must assume if this act is to be effective and fully implemented.
>
> These new and additional responsibilities would have to take their place alongside the many other necessary and essential duties that are part of our own State programs and other Federal programs already in operation.
>
> Because of these factors, in addition to the additional responsibilities that are coming daily, the provisions of title V are most necessary.
>
> It goes without question that a well staffed State educational agency with an adequate budget is essential to the planning, the guidance, and the coordination of an educational program equal to the challenge, the needs, and the demands of our 20th century society.
>
> One of the measures of adequacy regarding State educational agencies is the ratio of personnel to school enrollment. Nationally, these ratios range from 1 State educational employee for every 2,274 pupils to 1 State educational employee for every 55,719 pupils, with the average being 1 for each 10,890 pupils.

I would note that Michigan ranks 45th in the Nation with only 5 States having a higher ratio than the Michigan ratio of 1 State education employee for every 22,217 pupils.

This is deplorable and needs immediate correction.

The passage of this title would do much to help alleviate this situation.

In the face of this kind of evidence, title V is the title of this bill which provides positive assurance that the work and responsibilities that are added to the work and responsibilities already carried on by State departments of education by this bill will be carried on in a fashion that will in no way diminish the ability of those departments to administer the programs they already have.

This is a 5-year part of the bill. It originally started out with a matching formula in it. After we heard from the principal State offices throughout the country, the subcommittee recommended and the full committee agreed that during the first 2 years this title will be fully funded by Federal money, with no State matching funds involved. Starting the third year a matching formula which will give extra assistance to the poor States comes into effect.

Our thought in removing the matching provisions during the first 2 years was that we wanted to have money available immediately to the State school officials so that they could proceed to implement this legislation without any delay.

You have all read, as I have, with interest the special message that President Johnson sent to Congress on education. He made mention of the objectives of this title in that message. I recall his words to you. He said:

> State leadership becomes increasingly important as we seek to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education. We should assist the States by strengthening State departments of education in their efforts to provide consultative and technical assistance for local school districts and local school leadership, formulate long-range plans, expand educational research and development, improve local and State information about education, identify emerging educational problems, provide for the training of State and local education personnel, conduct periodic evaluation of educational programs.

And perhaps more important than anything promote teacher improvement courses.

The bulk of this money will be distributed throughout the States on a formula that is designed to be sure that every single State will receive at least a basic allotment of money that will make a meaningful contribution to a State department of education.

"Promote teacher improvement courses." Under this title an appropriation of $25 million is authorized for the fiscal year 1966. Eighty-five percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned in the following manner: Up to

2 percent will be reserved by the Commissioner for apportionment to American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; $100,000 will be apportioned by the Commissioner to each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia; and the remainder will be apportioned to the 50 States and the District of Columbia on the basis of the relative number of public school children in each State.

The basis grant portion of the title would be to assist State educational agencies in planning, initiating, and expanding activities designed to achieve the purpose of the title as set forth in section 501. To obtain these grants, States would submit applications to the Commissioner of Education through their State educational agencies.

Fifteen percent of the $25 million authorized for fiscal 1966, or $3,750,000 may be used by the Commissioner to make grants to States to pay part of the cost of experimental projects for developing State leadership or for the establishment of special services which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, hold promise of contributing substantially to the solution of problems common to the State educational agencies of all or several States. That is to say, for programs having regional or national significance.

Finally, I would like to repeat a statement made by Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, which seems to me to summarize the reasoning that serves as the basis for title V:

> In the long run, nothing we in education can do—whether in Washington or anywhere else—can be more important than strengthening the capacity of our States to respond to the educational needs of our time. This is the crux of the challenge. In education, we look to the States not merely as a matter of law or precedent, but as a matter of practical soundness and necessity.

In the conclusion of my discussion of title V, I should like once again to use a quotation, this time from Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, who testified before the committee on this title. This quotation relates to a matter that should be important to all Members, particularly to my friends on this side of the aisle, because it gives you a little bit of a clue as to the emphasis that is being placed on this by the people who are going to be charged with its administration. I quote from Commissioner of Education Keppel:

> In the long run, nothing we in education can do—whether in Washington or anywhere else—can be more important than strengthening the capacity of our States to respond to the educational needs of our time. This is the crux of the challenge. In education, we look to the States not merely as a matter of law or precedent, but as a matter of practical soundness and necessity. In this Nation of 50 States, with vast and independent enterprises for education, the Federal Government must participate—not toward domination, but as a partner in a vital enterprise.

The success of Federal investment in education depends upon dynamic and imaginative educational planning at all levels, particularly at the State level. Title V is an essential component of a full five-prong attack on the problems of poverty by the enrichment of the educational opportunities of culturally deprived children.

I would like to direct your attention above my head, above the Speaker's rostrum, above the gallery, and over the center door of the wall behind me where you will see inscribed a quotation by Daniel Webster—

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

If there was ever a time when the Members of the Congress of the United States had a greater opportunity to prove that they are willing to accept the admonition inscribed on the wall of this Chamber, this is the day.

This is our second day of debate on the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The question of the Federal Government's role and obligation in education has been before the Congress in one form or another for the past 100 years. However, never at anytime in that 100 years has the need for enlightened action by the Congress been greater than it is now.

There are 5 million children of poverty doomed to be a continuing part of the vicious poverty cycle by the lack of educational opportunities which this legislation can provide.

We have it within our power at this moment, in this Congress, to determine whether these 5 million school age children of poverty will escape this cycle or will themselves become parents of poverty within the next decade.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS].

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2362 or the administration education bill for the educationally deprived. If I may borrow from my eloquent colleague from Texas, Mr. JAMES C. WRIGHT—it has a little bit of good for everybody in it—a spoonful of dirt for every watershed. It aims at 90 percent of the school districts of the Nation. As wild as the shooting is in this bill, I can scarcely see how they missed 10 percent of the counties. It seems to me that any such bundle of grapeshot would have reached the entire Nation and not discriminated against 10 percent of our counties for no just or sound reasoning.

Never have so many underprivileged children been talked about so much and been helped so little as in this bill. I defy anyone to show me how any underprivileged child will be helped any more than the richest kid in town in title I of this bill. I admit to a slight bone being thrown to the impoverished child in title II where he will get Federal supplied books, the most dangerous of all areas. I also can conceive that in title III where $100 billion is proposed as a gift to school boards throughout the country to do with whatever they wish—a truly astonishing grant—the impoverished child may possibly get an additional crumb, in some specialized supplementary Federal Government school.

The history of the Republic may be clearly seen in this bill. For 95 years the Central Government has attempted to appropriate the last and most important function of the State, and that is education. Even now, thoughtful men cry out for us to halt.

Is there a need? Fifteen years ago when the late Senator Taft saw the tremendous influx of war babies hitting the elementary schools there was legitimate concern that many of the States would be unable to make it. Federal aid at that time might have had some reason to it. Now the crisis generally is past. The States themselves have done a magnificent job generally speaking. With an enrollment increase of 42 percent, they have increased expenditures 157 percent. The States and local communities have produced or borrowed 95 percent of this expenditure increase. The immediate need for surface pump priming which this bill provides is over, or certainly not grave. It is as if, to borrow from Dr. Samuel Johnson, the States, like spent swimmers in midstream have gasped and fought their way to the shore and as they are pulling themselves out on the banks, the Federal Government now rushes down to encumber them with help.

Are there special and individual needs throughout the Nation, or below the surface needs as compared to general needs? The answer is "Yes." All educators are realistic enough to appreciate a distribution of ready Federal cash.

I read a telegram I received this morning:

> This wire is to express our continued interest in H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. It is our sincere hope that you will oppose all amendments, vote against the motion to recommit, and vote for H.R. 2362 for final passage. Your interest is appreciated.
>
> J. REVIS HALL,
> *Superintendent, Anniston City Schools.*

I came from a State that spends as much of its income percentagewise as New York does on education, which is less than half what New York spends. We are admittedly down the ladder in education. We are on the brink of having this body turn our entire State over to illiterates, both Negro and white, and the very number of them frightens us. Few States suffer this number of illiterates. A voting rights bill eliminating literacy tests is punitive only to my State, Mississippi, and several others.

Nevertheless, I shall vote against this bill even with the amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon which at least gives some degree of honor to the bill. That amendment which gives substantial aid to the poorer States saves the bill from having a spurious appeal to an ideal which is not reached in fact by the actual bill itself. Yes, I shall vote for the Green amendment. As my good friend Judge Smith has stated: If the hour of history is at hand when a crown of thorns must be worn, then let us aim our first volley where the needs are.

The real irony of the thing is that if there is a need, the need was produced

by this body—by the failure of this body to relinquish certain taxing areas back to the States—the drying up of the tax sources by the preemptive quality of the taxing power has provided the need itself. John Marshall's dictum in McCulloch against Maryland comes to mind. The power to tax is the power to destroy.

There is a way to take care of the need. It is contained in the Republican Educational Incentive Plan. Federal tax credits will be allowed whenever an individual has paid a State educational tax.

This resolves the public and private school issues. It is the great new concept in Federal-State relationships. If it is now only an idea in this "Great Society," it is the best and most promising idea in the last 30 years. It may ultimately save this Republic.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I believe that, with respect to almost every educational bill which has ever been before this House, I have given my wholehearted support after we have been able to work out in the committee certain amendments to strengthen the bill. There is no question in my mind that the educational opportunities in this country must be expanded and the quality of education in all of our schools—whether they be in Oregon; or in Alabama, as the preceding speaker said; or in New York; or in Pennsylvania; or in any other State—must be improved. We must work to improve the quality of instruction.

On the bill which is now before this House I do have some reservations—reservations which have been expressed by the spokesmen for many organizations which are opposing this bill, or are urging judicial review, or are urging a change in formula.

Mr. Chairman, first I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this House the declaration of policy as set forth on page 70 of the bill.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 201. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Mr. Chairman, it is my contention that if this is really the intent, to provide better educational programs for the needs of the most educationally deprived children who come from families with low incomes—and in this bill it is defined as those children who come from families with less than $2,000 income—it is exceedingly difficult for me to reconcile the results produced by this formula.

Mr. Chairman, the facts are irrefutable that under this formula the very States who are the poorest get the least amount of money. Let me list the 12 lowest: Alabama, the State from which the gentleman who just preceded me spoke [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS], $140 for each poor child from the State of Alabama. Arkansas, with a low per capita income, gets $151; Idaho, $152; Georgia, $153; Kentucky, $150; Mississippi, the lowest of any State in the Union, $120; North Carolina, $160; Oklahoma, $175; South Carolina, the second lowest of any of the 50 States, $132; Tennessee, $145; Virginia, $175; West Virginia, $150.

Now, if I may take a few examples, Kentucky and Louisiana have almost the same number of educationally deprived children as defined in this legislation. Kentucky has approximately 188,000 and Louisiana approximately 190,000. Yet for every poor child in the districts where these poor children are in Kentucky, for every poor child we will give them $150 or $28.2 million total. In Louisiana we will give for every poor child $199, or a total of $37.9 million. Thus Kentucky and Louisiana have almost the same number of eligible children as defined in this bill and Louisiana will receive almost $10 million more or $49 more per child.

Let me take the two extremes—Mississippi and New York. Mississippi has 232,600, approximately, eligible children or poor children as defined in this bill. They will get only $120 for each one or a total of $28 million. However, in New York, with a per capita income of almost $3,000 compared to Mississippi's $1,379, with 260,000 of their children defined as "poor" in this bill—New York will get not $28 million but $91 million or $353 for each child as defined in this bill.

Now, may I ask, where is the justice, where is the equity in this, to give the State which has the highest or one of the highest per capita incomes the most money? I am sorry to say I am forced to agree with one of the speakers yesterday that under this formula the rich States who have the most money for education get more and the poorer States are the ones that get the least. The old quotation, "To those who have will be given."

Let me cite the results in a couple of counties. In Sunflower County, Miss., there are almost the same number of poor children as defined in this bill as there are in Westchester County, N.Y., which I have never heard described as a particular depressed area. In Sunflower County, Miss., for every poor child we will give $120 or a total of $754,173. But in Westchester County for every poor child we will give $353. So for almost the same number of children in Mississippi we will give them $754,000 but in Westchester County we will give them $2.2 million or almost three times as much.

Let me take two other counties—Greene County, Tenn., which has about 3,324 poor children as defined in this bill and Oneida County in New York which has about 3,260 or almost the same number. However, in Tennessee we will give for the poor child $145 and the total amount Greene County, Tenn., will receive is $483,643. But the county in New York with the same number will get over $1 million.

There are other counties close by and if time permitted I would like to include them. Franklin County, Pa., has almost the same number as Burlington County, N.J. Franklin County, Pa., will get $406,000. Burlington County, N.J., will get $477,000.

Certainly I would say to my colleagues there must be a more equitable way to allocate the funds if we are truly interested in what we say we are, in the policy statement, in trying to raise the standards of educationally deprived children in those areas where there is the highest concentration of such families.

The other morning, in the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Indiana talked at some length, and very accurately, about the number of rejectees under the Selective Service Act. It is shocking that in some of the States over 50 percent of our young men cannot pass the Selective Service test because of lack of mental qualifications. And yet, under the formula in this bill we do the very least for those States that have the highest percentage of rejectees. Those States that have had turned back the largest number will get the smallest amount in dollars.

It has been said that it costs more to provide education in New York than it does in Mississippi or South Carolina or Alabama. I think this is debatable. I suspect that there would be a great many people in Mississippi or Alabama or South Carolina, if they had the per capita income, who would like to attract the best teachers in the country and offer salaries in the $7,000 and $8,000 bracket. But it surely does not cost more to construct buildings or to hire teachers in New York than it does in Alaska, where we have the highest cost of living. And yet in New York we give $353 per child and in Alaska $267. It does not cost more for education in New York than in Illinois or in Pennsylvania or the District of Columbia. And yet there are no two States in the Union that receive the same amount of money for the poor children.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that all of you have read the article in this morning's Washington Post by Jimmy Breslin. If you have not read it, I would call your attention to it and express the hope that before the day is over you will read it. This article says that "Lowdnes' Little-Fed Schoolhouse Sits With Roof Flapping in Wind."

I include it at this point in the RECORD:

NEGRO EDUCATION IN ALABAMA—LOWNDES' LITTLE-FED SCHOOLHOUSE SITS WITH ROOF FLAPPING IN WIND

(By Jimmy Breslin, Herald Tribune News Service)

MONTGOMERY, ALA., March 24.—The Rolen School sits in the dirt off U.S. Highway 80 in Lowndes County, Ala. It is a public school of the State of Alabama for grades one to six. It has 80 Negro students and 3 Negro teachers. It is open from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. but from the road it looks like a deserted shack.

The Rolen School is a wooden building that was a church when people in Lowndes

County wore Confederate uniforms. It once was painted yellow. The building sits off the ground on small piles of loose red bricks. It has 10 frame windows. Nearly all of the panes are broken.

Beaverboard, put up on the inside, covers the broken windows. The school has a tin roof. Today, part of the roof was flapping in the breeze coming through the fields.

A shack in the dirt field behind the school serves as a bathroom. A long-handled ax stands against the building. The students gather wood at lunch and then chop it for the fires inside.

The school has five wooden steps, rotted. An adult cannot stand on them.

PERMIT NEEDED TO ENTER

The principal, John Bowen, who also teaches the fifth and sixth grades, stood outside the school today. He is 40, and has gray-topped hair. He wore a long-sleeved dark blue sports shirt. His arms were folded in front of him and he spoke quietly.

"Nobody is allowed inside the school without a permit, we were told," he said.

"When did they tell you this?"

"Well, when all the people started coming around here they told me that."

"I see. They don't want anybody to get a look at the place."

"Well," he said, "I work for the county school system. You shouldn't work for a person, then give him bad publicity. But I have to say you can't learn in this school. There's no way to learn here. It's just impossible."

"If you'll excuse me, I'm going to go into your school without this permit."

THE VIEW INSIDE

The inside of the school was divided into three rooms. The first and second grades were in the room on the left. There were 11 small black faces with big eyes sitting on those benches around a wooden picnic table. A girl was on her stomach on another bench, looking up at the visitor. The teacher, Josephine Jackson, wearing a pink dress, sat at a bridge table in the corner, next to a big rusted stove.

Beaverboard covers the classroom window, but light comes in through large holes in the side of the building. The holes give the kids a view of the fields. The kids also can look through a huge hole in the floor and see coal ashes and empty pork and bean cans on the ground under the classroom.

"We use coal, when we can get it, and wood in the winter," Miss Jackson said. "It runs to, oh, 'bout 25 degrees here in the winter. We hardly ever get below zero. The children wear hair rags and overcoats. They don't have gloves. When it gets too cold they sit with their hands in the coat pockets."

"Can you get anything done here at all?"

"Well, I try as hard as I can."

"Do the parents know what's going on?"

"Oh, I don't think they understand, either," she said. "They went to the same kind of school as this and these children here will have to send their children to a school like this and, oh, I guess it never will come to an end."

BRIGHT PUPIL

"Do you have a bright one?" Miss Jackson was asked.

"That one," she said, pointing to a little girl in pigtails and white sweater.

The top of the girl's workbook said her name was Janice Cosby. On the first page, she had printed, "See the kitten. The kitten says mew mew." It was done neatly.

"Do you like school?" she was asked.

Her eyes brightened and her head shook up and down. "Yop," she said.

"Do you do any writing at home?"

"Yop. In the backyard when I get home."

"What does her father do?" the teacher was asked.

"Farmer," she said. "Sharecropper."

"And what happens to the girl here?"

"When she gets old enough, she goes into the field and picks cotton and doesn't come to school any more."

CARDBOARD DOOR PANELS

A door with cardboard panels led to the next classroom, which was for the third and fourth grades. Old Alabama license plates were nailed here and there around the room to cover holes in the floor.

A heavy woman in a striped dress stood against the wall and watched the 17 students, who sat on benches and did nothing.

The fifth and sixth grades were in the backroom, a big, bare place with cement blocks and pieces of charred firewood on the floor. A kid in a raincoat was hammering a nail into a bench that was falling apart.

A small cluttered table, with an old blue globe on it, was in the front of the room. There were no blackboards or charts hanging on the wooden walls.

There were some 25-year-old schoolbooks on a shelf.

LUNCHLESS LUNCH TIME

A hand bell tinkled in the next room and kids walked out the door into the yard. It was lunch time. Most of them stood in the dirt or went in front of the building and sat on the top step. None of them had anything with them to eat.

"Hey," one of them was asked, "don't you have anything for lunch?" He shook his head yes.

"Light bread and hot sauce. I eat it on the way to school."

"Don't they get any lunch to bring?" Bowen was asked. He shrugged. He could see the visitor did not understand Lowndes County, Ala.

The visitor to the Rolen School got into the car and drove out on to the highway and back to Montgomery. The marchers were by the airport now, and the line was long.

They march in the sun because of things like the Rolen School.

And in the State capitol, which sits under a flagpole that has the Confederate flag flying over the American flag, the legislature passed a special resolution condemning the ministers who are in the civil rights march and calling attention to all "the fornicating" going on among the marchers.

And the Governor of the State of Alabama, which, in the year 1965, in the United States of America, has the Rolen School as part of its great educational system, sits in his office and says he is not going to give in to this mob rule of Communists.

The people here must be seen to be believed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from New York for being so liberal after the gentleman on my side could find no more time. But seriously, may I say to my liberal friends on my side of the aisle, after the liberality on my left, that we—and I include myself—we who have been talking about the conditions in Mississippi and who have been talking about and deploring the conditions in Alabama and other Southern States now have a chance to do something besides talk.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me for a question?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As a Mississippian, may I say to the gentlewoman that I am very grateful to her for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I would like for the gentlewoman to go one step further—and I am sure she has the information at hand—and tell the House whether or not Mississippi spends as high or probably a higher percentage of its tax dollar for education than any other State in the Union?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. In terms of effort index—and I cannot quickly go down all the States, so I cannot answer your question as to whether you have the highest—the national average effort index—and this is based upon the number of dollars actually spent in terms of per capita income—is 4.6 percent. In Mississippi, you have an effort index of 5.04, which is higher than the national average.

May I say to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] that your effort index in Mississippi, the effort that you are making to try to provide better schools, is higher than in the State of New York. Yet you would get only $120 under the provisions of this bill and New York would receive $353.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I read the article to which the gentlewoman has referred in the morning Post and think that the facts set forth in that article represent a tragic situation. But I am concerned that if we gave to the State of Alabama, with the present Governor of Alabama and the present legislature in Alabama, all of the money provided for in this bill, does the gentlewoman feel they would do anything for that particular school?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have confidence that there would be an attempt made, after the passage of the civil rights bill. If we were talking about 5 years ago, I might have the same reservations which the gentleman from Ohio has. However, I believe that in every State there are indications that they want to do something about it and are making greater effort than in many northern States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I complete my statement before yielding further? Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I really am serious in saying to my liberal colleagues, those of you who honestly and sincerely have been terribly concerned about the events in Selma, concerned about events in Mississippi during the last 2 or 3 years: Are you really shedding crocodile tears? Are we making pious statements about how awful things are and how we really want to do something about it, and then, when we have a bill that is before the House, we do the very least for these States of any single State in the Nation?

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not fit into my sense of fairness and justice.

I know that it has been said that it costs more to provide education to chil-

dren in the State of New York, but it costs no more than in Chicago, or Alaska, or Washington, D.C.—yet the dollars per child are considerably higher. I am told it will be said later that we increase the percentage going to the budgets in these States in the South more than we do in the northern States. This seems to me pretty irrelevant, how much and what percentage increase in the budget, because if you have absolutely nothing and you give them $5, you have increased it percentagewise 500 percent. If you are spending $700 in New York and you have been given $350 more, then you are not going to increase them so much percentagewise.

This seems to me to be a very funny kind of an argument. It seems to me we should be working in this formula so that it can be applied on a fair and equitable basis nationwide in an effort to raise the standards for educationally deprived children who come from families with an income of less than $2,000, no matter in what State they may reside.

May I also suggest that if this is not the purpose of the bill, then let us not fool the American people. If our purpose is to give the most money to those States that already spend the most, and they already have the greatest resources, then let us state it in the declaration of policy and not pretend that we are really trying to spend the money where we have the highest concentrations of poor children.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I hope to offer a formula in the form of an amendment to this bill which will allow every poor child, no matter in what State he resides, to have the same amount of money allocated under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be fair and equitable.

Therefore, if the formula is as we say we intend it to be, then we would provide the same kind of opportunity to all children whether they be located in the South, in the North, the East or the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional minute to answer a question.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. The State of Utah last year had the somewhat dubious distinction of being the first State ever to be sanctioned by the National Education Association. I believe the root of the problem was the inadequate salaries the State was then able to pay our teachers. Our neighbors to the north of us in Idaho have an even lower salary schedule than we do. The question I have is this: Would this bill with its present formula help close the disparity between states like Utah and Idaho as compared with our nearby neighbor, California, or would it widen the disparity?

Mrs. GREEN or Oregon. Mr. Chairman, may I congratulate the gentleman on having one of the highest effort indexes in the United States. You have 6.3. Under this formula you would get $187 for each child. In California they will get $265, and in the neighboring States it would vary, as well as all over the country.

I think the answer to the gentleman's question is: It would widen the gap, because the States already having the most would still have more money, and you would be in a less competitive position to attract teachers.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. I should like to inform the gentleman who got exercised over whether or not Alabama would use Federal money, if granted in this bill for education, that in the last 2 years Alabama has borrowed $100 million directly to go into the educational fund, we have borrowed $30 million last year for schools, and we are at the point of borrowing $125 million more for schools. In this case the Federal Government has refused to relinquish its taxing powers to the States themselves, and we had to go to the sales tax to do this financing. We have a 4-percent sales tax to take care of these borrowed funds.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. That is not too much to brag about. We have had a sales tax in Ohio for 25 years, and that was for the education of all children.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, some of our colleagues may vote for this bill because they think it will cure poverty. Others may vote for this bill, not as poverty legislation, but as a general aid to education bill. It ought to be one or the other but, unfortunately, it is a poor bill for either purpose.

The gentlewoman from Oregon [Mr. GREEN] has done an excellent job of pointing out how inequitable and unfair is the formula insofar as it allocates funds among the several States—under this bill, the States which need the most get the least—and the States which need the least get the most.

I should like to make the further point that the bill is inequitable and unfair not only as it allocates funds among the States, but also as it allocates funds among the school districts and counties within a State. Keep in mind that the criteria for eligibility of a school district or county is based upon the number of children in families with annual incomes of less than $2,000. Eligibility for assistance under this bill is not related to the actual need or the wealth or ability of a school district to finance an adequate educational program.

For purposes of illustration, consider a typical situation: The Members will have situations like this in their congressional districts, and in their States.

Assume for a moment that school district A has no industrial or valuable commercial property within it. It is a residential district. Most of the people within this suburban area are unskilled and semiskilled workers employed in a plant which is not located in the school district. Assume that there is little or no unemployment, and that the average income of the families is over $2,000. The average income may be in the neighborhood of $3,000, $4,000, or $5,000. However, this particular school district, relatively speaking, is a poor school district within the State. Indeed, it might be the poorest. It is bonded to the limit of its ability to bond. Its teachers are poorly paid; and its classrooms are crowded.

However, because district A does not have the requisite number of children from families with incomes less than $2,000, the school district is not elegible for any assistance at all under this bill. Keep in mind that the State cannot put aid provided by this bill into a district that does not qualify, no matter what the needs of that school district may be.

Suppose further, that in adjacent school district B, where an industrial plant is located, there are in the shadows of this plant some families with incomes of less than $2,000. However, in school district B, because of the presence of the industrial plant and other commercial property, the assessed valuation is three, four, or five times the amount of that in district A. Relatively speaking, school district B is a wealthy district; wealthy because it has valuable industrial and commercial property which is taxable, and because most of the people have high incomes. School district B has a good school system; good buildings and the classrooms are not crowded. However, because the requisite number of children from low-income families live there, wealthy school district B is eligible to receive aid under this bill.

It is not clear whether the purpose of this bill is to cure poverty or to provide general aid to education. But, surely, in either case, we ought to insist on a more equitable formula than the one provided in this bill.

Let me focus attention on another inequity in this bill. It is frequently said that eligibility under this bill is based solely on the number of children from families with incomes of less than $2,000. There is an exception to that in the bill. As the result of an amendment offered in the committee by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], and adopted by a divided vote, a family that is on welfare—aid to dependent children welfare—will be counted under this bill in determining the eligibility of a school district or county, even though the income of that family on welfare may exceed $2,000.

As I understand it, in some of the larger cities, like Chicago and New York, families on welfare average as much as $3,200 a year. Certainly, these are poor families and we should be concerned about them in devising any formula which is to be based upon poverty. But is the formula in the bill an equitable formula, and does it make sense?

What about a family with the same number of children where the head of

the family is earning $3,200? A family which earns $3,200 will not be counted; but a family on welfare with income of $3,200 will be counted.

What about the situation of a totally disabled head of the family who is on social security? This family may be just as poor as the family on welfare—and just as unable to pay local school taxes; but the family of a disabled social security beneficiary will not be counted under this bill in determining eligibility if its income exceeds $2,000.

What about the disabled veteran receiving a veteran's pension? He is unable to work, with children to support, and unable to pay his taxes, unless he has some special State or local exemption. If his income exceeds $2,000, he will not be counted and his children will not be counted in determining eligibility under this bill. Surely, the poverty formula established in this bill, insofar as it counts certain welfare families but excludes others who are equally poor, is inequitable and unfair.

I should like to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] to ask if he would quarrel with what I have said.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman talked about a man who earns $3,200 a year against the individual on public assistance. What happens in the case of the individual who earns this money? He is not a burden on the local community and the taxpayers are not supporting his family. He earns that money and is within that bracket. But the family that is on public assistance, the community gets this twice. First they must provide the $3,200 of public assistance out of the taxpayers' pockets, then they must provide the educational facilities for the same family. So I submit the analogy the gentleman made does not hold water.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He may find justification in his mind, but I do not.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to focus attention on page 80, subparagraph (7); section 205 of the bill relating to the application of a local educational agency and the provisions which must be agreed to by a local educational agency "consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner of Education may establish." Subparagraph (7), at line 17 reads as follows:

"(7) that wherever there is, in the area served by the local educational agency, a community action program approved pursuant to title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), the programs and projects * * *

I assume that means programs and projects under this aid to education bill "have been developed in cooperation with the public or private nonprofit agency responsible for the community action program."

I should like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] if it is not true that an amendment was offered in Committee to strike out the words "in cooperation with the public or private nonprofit agency responsible for the community action program" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "after consultation with". And, is it not true that this amendment was rejected?

Mr. PERKINS. That amendment, I think, was discussed—but let me say——

Mr. GRIFFIN. The only purpose for which I have yielded to the gentleman from Kentucky at this time is to answer the question.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me make this clear.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I shall yield to the gentleman later but not at this point.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman should let me explain.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I cannot yield to the gentleman at this time but I shall yield to the gentleman later.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wished to substantiate that an amendment was offered in committee to strike out the words "in cooperation with" and to insert the words "after consultation with". Now, if a local educational agency cannot take action under this bill except "in cooperation with" the local, public or nonprofit agency which has been designated to operate the community action program under the poverty bill, that could be a disturbing situation.

What does "cooperation" mean? In light of the legislative history, "cooperation" in this case may mean that the public or nonprofit agency in charge of the local poverty program would have a veto power over what the local educational agency could do under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. There ought, at least, to be notice of the fact that the so-called aid to education program provided by this bill not be run exclusively by the local educational agency. It will be run by the local school system "in cooperation with" whatever organization the poverty administration downtown may have selected to run the local poverty program in the particular community.

Now, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky who may be able to throw some light on this situation.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that in a community where you have—assuming that this bill is enacted and assuming that you had a community action program—a preschool program we provide in the legislation for consultation, as it should be, for the purposes of preventing overlap or duplication of effort. But we specifically make it clear that the community action agency could not veto a school program provided for in this bill. If the gentleman will turn to page 8 in the committee report, he will find this language:

This section does not give the community action agency any veto over programs developed by the local public educational agency under title I of this bill.

That is very clear. The provision should be in the bill, because there should be consultation and there should be cooperation of that type.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman is saying, even though an amendment was rejected in the committee which would have required only "consultation," that the words "in cooperation with" require only consultation. Is that what the gentleman is saying? Or, does "cooperation" require more than consultation?

Mr. PERKINS. I have been reminded that we had discussion of an amendment of that type, but it was never offered in the subcommittee or full committee.

The important thing is that this program is administered by a public agency. They have control of the funds and the property. If the gentleman will look on page 79, lines 18 and 19, he will see the language:

A public agency will administer such funds and property.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In light of the legislative history, which concerned me, I am glad to have the gentleman's statement that there is no such veto power. I do recognize that a statement to that effect is made in the report. It is important, however, to reiterate it on the floor, in order to make it clear that a local agency in charge of the community's poverty program will not be able to veto a program put into effect by a local educational agency under this bill. I was concerned, and I believe with some reason, that the words "in cooperation with" as used in the bill might require cooperation. I suppose with the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky, we can be assured that a local educational agency will not have to cooperate, so long as there is consultation.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe we have made that perfectly clear, and the gentleman well understands it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Over and over again during the debate reference has been made to the approximate cost of title I, with the cost of title I stated as being $1 billion.

I believe it should be kept in mind that there is no ceiling on the authorization in title I in the bill as reported; the bill contains an open end authorization.

Title I is an amendment to Public Law 874. Once enacted, the authorization will go up automatically above $1 billion, depending on how many districts or counties should be entitled from time to time to funds under this formula. So, there is no ceiling, as I understand it, on the authorization in the bill.

Others have focused attention upon the broad and unlimited authority of the Commissioner of Education to appoint advisory councils. I should like again to focus attention upon section 602 of the bill, on page 145, which provides:

The Commissioner may, without regard to the civil service laws, * * * appoint an advisory council or councils to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to carrying out his functions under this or any other law.

Those who are appointed to these advisory councils will receive $100 a day. Under the bill, there is no limit as to how many councils can be appointed or how many people will be appointed to each council. The authority to appoint such advisory councils is not even limited to the objectives of this bill; the Commissioner will have a blank check to appoint as many people as he wants to advise

him with respect to his functions under any law.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The education bill before us represents years of study, work, and research of the need for Federal assistance to schools. It marks the beginning of the combined efforts of all of us to improve the quality of education in elementary and secondary schools. The bill goes a long way in wiping out educational inequalities in underprivileged communities. By using the children of low-income families as a formula for aid, the bill gives recognition to the special need of deprived children.

The main purpose of the bill is to improve schools in low-income districts. About 90 percent of all districts in the United States are expected to qualify for at least some of this money.

H.R. 2362 gives some assistance to children who attend private and church-related schools to the extent that children who attend private and parochial schools will be able to participate in certain public school programs if they qualify under the "disadvantaged definition." This is the most controversial portion of the bill. I believe that separation of church and state is essential to the integrity of public education as a foundation of a free society, and is imperative for the protection of freedom of religion itself. I believe, however, that sufficient safeguards exist in the bill to prevent violation of constitutional and ideological principles. These safeguards assure that all funds, facilities, and materials provided in the bill shall be under the control of the local public school authorities.

Nonpublic schoolchildren would benefit through a "shared time" arrangement as they already do in some areas. Nonpublic schools would not be given Federal funds under the bill, but would be given joint use of classrooms and other facilities. Consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district who are enrolled in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, the local educational agency will make provisions, under the terms of the bill, for including special educational services and arrangements such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, educational media centers and mobile educational services and equipment in which such children can participate.

Some broadening of public school programs and services in which nonpublic schoolchildren may participate is expected. Programs will be broadened to the extent there are poverty-stricken children in nonpublic schools. The local educational agency will maintain administrative supervision and control of all programs and all funds. The bill does not authorize any grant for any service to a private institution. It does not authorize payment of private school teaches' salaries; it does not authorize private school construction; it does not authorize purchase of equipment or materials for private schools.

Title I of the bill will authorize $1.06 billion to strengthen the educational fiber of economically deprived areas. It authorizes grants for local school districts for improvements and expansions which contribute particularly to meeting the special needs of educationally deprived children. The funds will be directed toward regions where families average less than $2,000 in annual income. School districts in these concentrations will be able to hire additional staff, construct needed facilities, acquire new equipment, and expend for other appropriate uses.

Mr. Chairman, a district would qualify for assistance if it has at least 100 public school children of families earning less than $2,000 a year, excluding welfare payments under aid to families with dependent children program, or if such children make up at least 3 percent of the enrollment. A qualifying district, on submitting satisfactory plans would get directly in return, for each impoverished child a sum equal to half the amount now being spent per child annually by the State on its public schools.

Briefly, here is what the bill would do for New York and other large cities. We are currently spending about $120 more per disadvantaged child than for the more fortunate child. All disadvantaged students in New York schools—public and nonpublic—will benefit from the services of the additional personnel in areas such as supplemental health and food services, guidance, summer schools, and work experience programs. Special materials and programs, library and cultural and remedial instruction, language labs, science services, preschool training programs, will be available to all schoolchildren. The bill will help to provide an expansion of our system of all-day neighborhood schools. Needy students would be helped at the college level by a program of scholarships, loans, and work-study opportunities.

The estimated first-year fund allocation proposed in H.R. 2362, based on one-half of the individual State's per pupil average cost of education, for the State of New York, would be $91,893,253.

H.R. 2362 recognizes the cost of education per pupil in New York to meet their needs, and it will assist all children who are in need.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support title II of the bill which provides for the improvement of school library resources and other instructional materials for all schoolchildren. Many of our children are attending schools without libraries—about one-half of our schools have no libraries—and these children are being deprived of a great and valuable resource which this bill would provide. This title would authorize allotments of $100 million to the States to be expended under a State plan developed by a State agency. It would provide a program for the acquisition of library resources, including audiovisual materials, textbooks, and other instructional materials for children in elementary and secondary schools.

The State plan would take into consideration the relative need of children and teachers for such materials and provide assurance that such materials would be provided on an equitable basis for all elementary and secondary schoolchildren and teachers. The State agency would be required to administer the program in conformity with State law. State plans must set forth their criteria in distributing the library resources, textbooks, and other material. This authorization is not intended for the advantage of any specific private institutions. On the contrary, the bill insures that the benefits will accrue directly to the schoolchildren.

Title III offers supplemental educational centers and services. Local educational agencies may apply to the Commissioner of Education for a center or certain services especially designed to meet the varying needs and interests of school localities. Such applications must be approved by the State educational authority; and $100 million is authorized under this title for fiscal year 1966. Title III is designed to allow school districts to effectuate programs and services which the local educational authorities deem essential to their school system, and which are currently overshadowed by budgetary demands. This title is meant to provide services such as guidance, counseling, remedial instruction, and health programs.

Title IV provides new and expanded programs of research and development to promote quality education in all schools of this Nation. This title can bring about the types of change in our educational system which will produce quality in educational materials, excellence in teaching, and reawaken the wonder of learning in children. Regional educational laboratories can offer a promising way of meeting problems of research, development, and dissemination. The laboratories will have close ties with the State departments of education. They will also work directly with the schools and supplementary education centers in order to bring innovation directly to the student.

Title V establishes a 5-year program of grants to be made by the Commissioner of Education to assist States in strengthening their State educational agencies, through State programs which may include long-range State planning, training of educational personnel, consultative and technical assistance to local schools, and expansion of education research.

Title VI includes a provision that nothing contained in the act may be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system. This title also provides that nothing in the act may be construed to authorize the making of any payment for religious worship or instruction.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2362 would provide tremendous improvements in the educational standards and facilities for the children of Puerto Rico. Title I of the bill would contribute approximately $30 million to Puerto Rico's school system. It would provide more than one-fourth of the amount appropriated for education by the government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in 1963.

Sixty percent of the families of Puerto Rico have incomes of less than $2,000 a year. This means that 488,000 families in Puerto Rico qualify in the low-income category provided in this bill.

As the distinguished delegate, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. POLANCO-ABREU], said in the House yesterday, no piece of legislation which has ever been before the Congress could mean so much as this bill in terms of creating opportunity for the children of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the many educational, labor and civic organizations who have written to me expressing their strong support of H.R. 2362. This bill will be a memorable piece of legislation in the field of education, not only in the scope of the program but in future programs. Although it is not perfect, the bill represents, in my opinion, a great step toward providing a better education for millions of children, including minority groups, and it will help break the vicious chain of hereditary poverty—the poverty that stems from cultural deprivation.

It represents a splendid beginning in a campaign to eliminate widespread differences in educational opportunity and establish a more democratic educational system that will take into account the long-ignored handicaps of the underprivileged and the culturally deprived children of our country.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362 which I believe will go a long way toward helping local communities meet the alarming rise in the cost of their educational programs at the elementary and secondary levels.

I do not believe there is a Member in this House of either party who can deny that the cost of public school education has increased in every local community throughout this country at a more rapid rate than any other single item in municipal budgets.

One reason for this fantastic increase is the need for specialized education to the children of this Nation's chronically impoverished families. This today is the highest item in our school budget anywhere in the Nation—rich State or poor State.

Let there be no mistake about H.R. 2362. President Johnson has demonstrated sound judgment in proposing the Federal Government help each individual local community meet the rising cost of providing education for these culturally deprived youngsters on the basis of standards established by each county. And I stress here, almost every county in the Nation has youngsters of impoverished families. I suggest every Member go over to the committee table and pick up a copy of this committee print which lists the number of impoverished children in each county in the United States. You will find the tabulation beginning on page 65 and it will show each Member the number of impoverished children in the counties in his district. The tabulation clearly shows there are poor children in every district in the country. Mrs. GREEN, I ask the rich to help the poor. Ten poor States will receive $330 million or one-third of the total—the other 40 States and 3 trust territories will share the remainder.

It makes sense that the Federal Government should become a partner in this effort because, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government today is spending billions of dollars throughout America to help maintain public assistance programs in local communities.

The Federal Government has more than just a passing interest in this problem for another reason. That is because so many of the indigent in our industrial centers are youngsters whose families have migrated to the urban areas of America simply because job opportunities have been eliminated in the rural sections of the Nation. This mobility becomes a Federal problem particularly since local communities cannot impose the cost of education for the children of these mobile families unto the community from whence they came.

It is important, however, to stress that this bill is designed to help the poor people all over America. I wish to emphasize that no community can get any assistance under title 1 unless it has children of impoverished families.

This bill properly recognizes that poverty is not limited to any one section or one community of America.

This bill properly recognizes that there are poor people in literally every section of our country, and this bill attempts to bring the most meaningful type of assistance to meet the peculiar problems of each individual community which has victims of poverty.

This bill recognizes that even in the great State of Texas, where Houston and Dallas are two of the richest communities in the world, there are still more than 386,000 children who come from families with an annual income of less than $2,000 a year.

This bill also recognizes that while we have the peak of prosperity in New Orleans, in the bayou country, and other parts of Louisiana, there are 190,000 children in impoverished families.

This bill also recognizes that throughout this country no single community has a monopoly on wealth nor is poverty confined to any single geographic area.

To the critics of the formula in this bill, I should like to stress over and over that no school district can qualify for assistance under title I unless it does, indeed, have children with families under $2,000 annual income or are on a public assistance program.

This bill further quite properly recognizes that each State in this Union has established its own standards consistent with its abilities. There are those who would try to change the formula to provide a single standard for the entire Nation in the amount of Federal assistance. The distinguished lady from Oregon apparently chooses to overlook the fact that it costs more to educate a child in Michigan or Illinois than it does to educate the same child in a poorer State. She presumes that the richer States should have a horn of plenty with no bottom.

I submit that advocates of a single standard, whether they want to admit it or not, in effect are saying that we should have in many communities of America a dual system of education with the poor children getting a lower standard of education.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for the Members of this House to know that in this bill, which would provide Federal aid for the education of impoverished children, we are also extending for 2 years Public Law 874, which is more commonly known as the federally impacted areas school bill. For the new Members of this House, who may not be familiar with this program of Federal aid to school areas impacted by Federal activities, let me hasten to tell you that we now spend some $350 million annually in direct Federal aid to local school districts throughout the United States, as the Federal Government's contribution toward helping to educate the children of people employed by the Federal Government. And mind you—this bill which we are today extending for 2 more years, provides that the Federal Government shall match one-half of the local cost in educating a child.

I have not heard critics of Mr. Johnson's formula suggest here in this Chamber that we change the impacted areas formula to a national standard. There are some 320 Members of this House whose districts share in the federally impacted areas program. And that program quite properly recognizes that it costs more to educate a child in a school district in Oregon than it does to educate a child in a school district in Louisiana or Mississippi. And quite properly, the Federal Government many years ago, when this impacted areas bill was first enacted, decided to meet one-half of the cost of education in the respective community, instead of applying a national norm, as critics of Mr. Johnson's formula suggest we do in the education bill before us today.

I am confident that we are dealing with reasonable men here in this House. I am confident that no Member of this House wants to ignore the problems of the individual States in meeting their school problems. I can think of no greater injustice than to have the Federal Government pay one-half of the cost, based on the cost in individual school districts under Public Law 874, which is in the bill before us today, and then adopt a national norm for the poor children in the same respective State. In other words, what they are saying is, go ahead and let the Federal Government pay one-half the per-student cost of educating a child in a school district in Missouri who comes under Public Law

874—the impacted areas bill—but for every child in that school system from an impoverished family, the Federal Government will pay only one-half of a national norm. It just does not make sense. But that is exactly what those who would change the formula would do.

And Mr. Chairman, I submit here and now that anyone who suggests that the facts are other than as I have stated them to be, makes a stranger of the truth.

Make no mistake. If we were to accept an amendment to this formula providing for a national norm, it would not be long before local school districts would set up one standard for the fortunate children of their community and another standard for the poor children. In those school districts where the per student cost is high, the poor student would get an inferior quality of education. In those school districts where the per student expenditure is below the national standard, the poor children would, in effect, be getting a substantially better education than the rest of the community.

President Johnson's proposal establishes a standard of equity where we permit each individual State to set its own criteria and then the Federal Government proceeds to meet half the cost of that State's criteria. This, to me, is a sound approach, and I should like to congratulate the committee for bringing forth an equitable bill.

Those who argue against this formula ignore the fact that different communities for various reasons have varying costs per pupil for education.

For example: Alabama spends $242 per year per pupil; Arkansas spends $261 per year per pupil; Mississippi spends $229 per year per pupil; Texas spends $358 per year per pupil; Illinois spends $504 per year per pupil; and New York spends a staggering $628 per year per pupil.

It therefore should be very clear to the critics of this formula that if this Federal aid is to be meaningful to every single State of this Union, it must help that individual State to meet the cost of education to the impoverished child's immediate community. Otherwise we would be in effect shortchanging the impoverished student who happens to be in a community of high educational expenditures.

At the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, I shall get permission to include a table showing the per pupil expenditures per State so that my colleagues can compare for themselves the equity in the formula suggested by President Johnson. To attempt any other formula than the one proposed by the committee would be to advocate a double standard of education in each community throughout America, and I doubt if that is the intent of this Congress.

Current expenditures per pupil by State [1]—selected school years 1945–46 to 1961–62

State	1945–46	1949–50	1955–56	1959–60	1961–62	State	1945–46	1949–50	1955–56	1959–60	1961–62
Total [2]	$136.41	$208.83	$294.22	$375.14	$418.50	Nebraska	$142.48	$217.07	$277.51	$336.98	$367.05
Alabama	68.57	117.09	187.64	241.15	242.29	Nevada	162.32	246.22	348.31	430.41	455.22
Alaska				[3] 546.32	[3] 619.37	New Hampshire	135.01	210.51	282.64	347.24	387.89
Arizona	136.93	240.70	312.35	403.56	447.23	New Jersey	211.82	279.81	381.96	487.54	535.43
Arkansas	64.76	111.71	160.47	225.17	261.34	New Mexico	134.60	222.48	318.01	362.67	410.81
California	169.21	[4]	[5] 343.54	[5] 424.00	[5] 457.00	New York	209.76	295.02	425.61	561.59	628.53
Colorado	136.12	219.66	305.58	396.14	429.45	North Carolina	81.43	140.82	188.69	237.24	301.08
Connecticut	174.39	254.62	340.87	436.08	493.71	North Dakota	138.02	226.27	286.80	366.69	403.04
Delaware	152.48	258.77	363.35	455.75	485.11	Ohio	147.03	202.12	282.91	365.04	397.23
Florida	103.31	181.27	257.60	317.64	350.58	Oklahoma	111.86	207.05	249.35	311.36	332.74
Georgia	64.60	123.37	194.03	253.47	288.81	Oregon	157.88	272.00	356.53	448.33	504.18
Hawaii				324.55	358.49	Pennsylvania	144.80	215.76	333.45	409.44	450.59
Idaho	116.55	186.00	245.89	289.70	[5] 321.30	Rhode Island	160.84	240.40	324.92	413.38	462.39
Illinois	175.11	258.46	353.48	438.41	504.77	South Carolina	74.31	122.39	188.09	220.06	246.31
Indiana	144.53	235.49	291.22	368.68	429.61	South Dakota	153.93	230.34	309.49	346.82	375.37
Iowa	143.88	230.53	299.05	367.71	411.06	Tennessee	76.16	132.17	188.95	238.07	259.06
Kansas	141.25	218.57	294.68	347.72	410.34	Texas	118.12	208.88	265.23	332.34	358.95
Kentucky	86.33	120.82	168.26	233.07	301.44	Utah	129.30	178.56	240.50	322.45	350.38
Louisiana	101.36	214.08	281.68	371.94	388.28	Vermont	122.89	192.87	262.66	343.93	[5] 407.60
Maine	109.39	157.47	221.52	282.73	323.88	Virginia	92.29	145.56	213.50	274.21	320.60
Maryland	126.19	213.39	297.09	392.70	440.07	Washington	183.33	247.63	332.11	420.42	468.34
Massachusetts	179.85	236.44	328.20	408.91	468.66	West Virginia	101.30	149.86	197.18	258.44	291.68
Michigan	147.33	219.55	330.40	415.10	452.95	Wisconsin	147.73	230.01	334.91	[6] 413.04	[6] 472.47
Minnesota	157.96	242.24	324.57	425.21	473.80	Wyoming	171.38	262.77	344.77	450.38	499.94
Mississippi	46.32	79.69	157.47	205.91	229.44	District of Columbia	172.22	256.24	348.87	431.16	462.30
Missouri	137.36	173.57	263.94	343.96	392.69	Alaska	218.02	317.19	418.66		
Montana	215.44	267.56	348.56	410.78	450.74	Hawaii	159.72	214.82	243.55		

[1] Data are for pupils in average daily attendance in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools.
[2] Beginning in 1959–60, totals include Alaska and Hawaii.
[3] Because of the high cost of living in Alaska, per pupil expenditure data for this State cannot readily be compared with those for other States.
[4] Not available.
[5] Estimated by Office of Education.
[6] Excludes vocational schools not operated as part of the regular public school system.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the 10 richest counties of America siphoning off money from the 10 poorest counties.

I think it is important to show that the 10 richest counties in this country, including Du Page County, Ill., spent a total of $466 million in 1962 for public education in these 10 counties. Under this bill, these 10 counties would receive $8.9 million or 1.9 percent of their total expenditure for public education in these 10 counties.

We are all concerned that the 10 poorest counties in the United States spent a total of only $13 million for public education. These 10 poorest counties would receive, true enough, only $4.5 million of Federal aid, but this $4.5 million constitutes 34.2 percent of Federal contribution to their educational expenditures.

At the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, I shall ask permission to include an appropriate table showing the comparison between the 10 wealthiest and 10 poorest counties in the United States.

Rich versus poor counties—The impact of Federal funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

[Dollars in thousands]

County	1962 educational expenditures [1]	Estimated fiscal 1966 Federal payment	Federal contribution as a percent of 1962 educational expenditures
Montgomery, Md	44,073	573	1.3
Arlington, Va	14,050	236	1.7
Fairfax, Va	26,950	349	1.3
Du Page, Ill	33,159	444	1.3
Marin, Calif	16,544	339	2.0
Westchester, N.Y	103,169	2,189	2.1
Bergen, N.J	72,214	1,315	1.8
Union, N.J	44,229	1,063	2.4
Montgomery, Pa	51,567	857	1.7
Fairfield, Conn	60,728	1,554	2.6
Total	466,683	8,919	1.9

Rich versus poor counties—The impact of Federal funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

County	1962 educational expenditures [1]	Estimated fiscal 1966 Federal payment	Federal contribution as a percent of 1962 educational expenditures
Grant, W. Va	507	125	24.7
Falls, Tex	1,504	432	28.7
Sunflower, Miss	2,197	745	33.9
Knox, Ky	1,475	471	31.9
Tensas, La	1,244	329	26.4
Williamsburg, S.C	2,248	811	36.1
Sumter, Ala	1,047	391	37.3
Holmes, Miss	1,226	547	44.6
Breathitt, Ky	1,129	300	26.6
Tunica, Miss	620	357	57.6
Total	13,197	4,508	34.2

[1] Taken from U.S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Governments, 1962, vol. IV, No. 4, Compendium of Government Finances, table 53, "Education other than capital outlay." This is the latest uniform listing by county of educational expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it also important to recall some other statistics which show how much the Federal Government is already spending to help the 10 poorest States in the Union meet the problem of feeding and clothing their impoverished families. I cite these figures to demonstrate that the Federal effort should be viewed as a whole instead of merely in terms of this one piece of legislation.

The Federal Government now contributes 75.9 percent of the total amount spent for public aid to poor families in Alabama; 76.1 percent to poor families in Arkansas; 75.2 percent to poor families in Georgia; 74.4 percent to poor families in Kentucky; 79.2 percent to poor families in Mississippi. Contrast this to the Federal Government's contribution of only 44 percent to the total amount spent for public welfare for the impoverished families in Illinois; 45 percent to impoverished families in California; 44 percent to impoverished families in New York; and 51 percent to impoverished families in Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, my point here is that it is unfair to say that we are somehow denying the poor families of our poorer States Federal aid at the expense of our richer States, because when you take the entire Federal effort and Federal contribution in all programs in these poorer States of the Union, you find that in each instance the Federal Government spends vastly more money for assistance in those 10 poorer States than it does in the rest of the Union.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that those who try to say that President Johnson's formula penalizes the poorer States to the advantage of the richer States are just muddling the facts.

Every State has its share of poor people, and I submit there is not a Member in this Congress who is not aware of the fact that every community in his district is today experiencing serious problems in meeting the needs of the poor people amongst them.

Mr. Chairman, I shall also include a series of other tables at the appropriate time which further justify the equity of the committee's carefully worked out formula. It is my hope that my colleagues will study these tables in the RECORD so that they can better understand how justified this committee is in its position.

One of the tables shows how much the individual States spend for education per pupil and a comparison between the States. This table clearly demonstrates that it does indeed cost a good deal more to educate a child in Illinois than some of the other States of the Union. Another table shows a comparison of per capita earnings and it is important to demonstrate that while Illinois spends more than twice as much per pupil for education, our per capita income is nowhere near twice as much as some of the poorer States.

Another table which I shall include in the RECORD shows the total State expenditure by States as compared to per capita income by States, and here again we find a substantial variance among the several States which could not be ignored by this committee in drawing up its distribution formula.

Another table shows the difference in salary standards, and these too must be considered in recognizing that if this legislation is to be meaningful to the respective school districts, it must be of a nature and amount which will help those local school districts meet the difference in cost for teaching personnel.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the wealth in States and their ability to meet their educational obligations. I believe we should study the comparative indebtedness of these so-called richer States in their effort to give their children a higher standard of education. Admittedly, Alabama is a poorer State, but Alabama has a State school indebtedness of only $109 million, compared to $1,119 million for Illinois; $2,458 million for New York; and $2,160 million for California.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this House will stand by the committee which has studied all the aspects of this problem, and after great deliberation has concluded that the formula before us is indeed the most equitable for all the people of the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I should like also to discuss briefly another aspect of this bill. Yesterday we witnessed a heated debate on proposals in this bill to bring some assistance to the private schools of America within the constitutional limitations. I believe the committee has done an excellent job in trying to find a constitutional balance for helping our nonpublic schools which are today educating more than 7 million American children at an annual saving to the taxpayers of more than $3 billion. The committee properly has recognized that students in private schools should be eligible for assistance in this act within the framework of constitutional limitations.

The committee has carefully drawn up a formula which has been approved by Monsignor McManus, superintendent of parochial schools in Chicago—the largest parochial school system in the world, and also by the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

I believe the formula is properly described on page 7 of the report, and I should like to cite that report at this point:

DUAL ENROLLMENT AND BROADENED PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAMS TO REACH ALL EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN

No provision of the bill authorizes any grant for providing any service to a private institution, but at the same time the bill does contemplate some broadening of public educational programs and services in which elementary and secondary school pupils who are not enrolled in public schools may participate. The extent of the broadened services will reflect the extent that there are educationally disadvantaged pupils who do not attend public school.

The bill does not authorize funds for the payment of private school teachers. Nor does it authorize the purchase of materials or equipment or the construction of facilities for private schools. However, consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district who are enrolled in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, the local educational agency will make provision, under the terms of the bill, for including special educational services and arrangements such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, educational media centers, and mobile educational services and equipment in which such children can participate.

Thus, the bill does anticipate broadened instructional offerings under publicly sponsored auspices which will be available to elementary and secondary school students who are not enrolled in public schools.

In this regard the committee has adopted language in the bill to assure that the local educational agency will maintain administrative supervision and control of the programs provided under the title and that the title to any property constructed or purchased shall be in a public agency and that a public agency will administer the funds and property for the purposes of the title. Several opportunities are afforded local public educational agencies to meet the special educational needs of elementary and secondary school pupils regardless of whether they are enrolled in public schools through supplementary educational services authorized by title I such as broadened health services, school breakfasts for poor children, and guidance and counseling services. In addition, testimony received by the committee indicated the effectiveness in some areas of providing mobile art collections which could serve a community of schools on a rotating basis and the broadening of mobile-type public library services.

There are other provisions in this act to give parochial schools assistance in the use of public school textbooks on a loan basis, which would bring badly needed help to the private schools for their indigent pupils. But in every instance, the committee was careful to preserve the basic constitutional safeguards.

I believe it is a credit to the religious organizations of this Nation, of all faiths and beliefs, that they have all rallied in their support for this bill. Those who would argue here that the bill either does not go far enough, or goes too far, should study the testimony of the most responsible and eminent religious leaders of America who have a deep and abiding sense of responsibility in this field. During the hearings on this bill, there was quite properly great concern expressed that the committee be careful not to tip the careful balance of separation of church and state. And the committee took this testimony into careful consideration.

So far as I know, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in the history of the United States that all religious denominations have sent witnesses to appear before this committee in support of the passage of such legislation, and specifically in support of the passage of the present legislation in its present, carefully worked out form.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that this bill, in its present form, will stand up to any subsequent test at any level of our judicial system.

This brings me to the final point I want to raise on this legislation, and that is the suggestion for judicial review.

There are those who urge some language be inserted in this measure to provide for judicial review; I suggest that such an amendment is not necessary; I suggest that it would expose every school district to harassing legal prob-

lems; it would result in a legal patchwork of judicial decisions.

This bill in its present form is subject to review by the U.S. Supreme Court, and, in view of the Supreme Court's most recent decision to rule on and review the use of prayers in the public schools, I cannot imagine for a moment that in this instance the Supreme Court would refuse a writ of certiorari to review the provisions of this bill which would give assistance to private schools.

I am sure that, just as soon as this bill becomes law, there will be any number of suits filed to challenge its constitutionality. We can make this statement with confidence because of suits brought before the Court challenging the higher education bill and the bill to aid medical schools which were passed in this Congress.

Furthermore, I should like to point out that this bill now has a provision for judicial review, whenever the Commissioner of Education refuses to grant a State any assistance. This provision is quite proper because a refusal by the Commissioner does not involve a constitutional question, and therefore we on the committee, wanting to make sure that a Commissioner of Education could not arbitrarily or capriciously deny a State Federal aid, have provided judicial review of his decisions in each of the titles.

But there is no need for such a proviso regarding the constitutionality of this legislation because no Member in this Chamber can seriously argue that a citizen cannot bring a suit testing those provisions in this bill which provide aid to the private schools' and church schools' indigent children.

Our refusal to put such language in this bill is to protect the local school administrators from arbitrary harassment.

But I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I am confident that a constitutional test will lie, and certiorari will issue, whenever anyone wants to challenge seriously the provisions of this legislation.

I, of course, would not venture to indicate the final outcome of what such a suit would be, but that is not the issue today. The issue is whether or not a constitutional test can be held, and I submit that the recent actions of the Supreme Court clearly indicate the Court would indeed entertain such a suit.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It would help relieve the local communities of this Nation in meeting the crisis they face to provide education for the impoverished and educationally deprived children of their areas. I hope this bill will be adopted by the House in the manner that it was reported by the committee.

The aforementioned tables follow:

Expenditures for public assistance by source of funds and State, calendar year 1963 [1]

State	Amount (thousands)					Percentage distribution				
	Total	Federal	State and local			Total	Federal	State and local		
			Total	State	Local			Total	State	Local
Total [2]	$5,183,683	$2,840,885	$2,342,798	$1,693,084	$649,714	100.0	54.8	45.2	32.7	12.5
Alabama	114,810	87,103	27,707	27,626	81	100.0	75.9	24.2	24.1	0.1
Alaska	4,521	2,187	2,334	2,334		100.0	48.4	51.6	51.6	
Arizona	29,178	20,057	9,121	9,092	29	100.0	68.7	31.3	31.2	.1
Arkansas	61,361	46,697	14,664	14,664		100.0	76.1	23.9	23.9	
California	761,728	348,160	413,568	269,084	144,484	100.0	45.7	54.3	35.3	19.0
Colorado	91,394	47,928	43,466	34,905	8,561	100.0	52.4	47.6	38.2	9.4
Connecticut	65,817	29,707	36,109	32,875	3,234	100.0	45.1	54.8	49.9	4.9
Delaware	5,889	3,306	2,584	1,683	901	100.0	56.1	43.9	28.6	15.3
Florida	98,327	71,820	26,507	23,380	3,127	100.0	73.0	27.0	23.8	3.2
Georgia	104,140	78,327	25,812	20,632	5,180	100.0	75.2	24.8	19.8	5.0
Hawaii	12,426	6,121	6,304	6,304		100.0	49.3	50.7	50.7	
Idaho	14,547	9,503	5,044	5,014	30	100.0	65.3	34.7	34.5	.2
Illinois	313,380	140,710	172,670	156,075	16,595	100.0	44.9	55.1	49.8	5.3
Indiana	44,982	29,391	15,590	9,281	6,310	100.0	65.3	34.6	20.6	14.0
Iowa	62,585	35,418	27,166	16,977	10,189	100.0	56.6	43.4	27.1	16.3
Kansas	53,892	29,476	24,417	11,973	12,444	100.0	54.7	55.3	22.2	23.1
Kentucky	79,235	58,946	20,289	19,402	887	100.0	74.4	25.6	24.5	1.1
Louisiana	187,609	133,012	54,598	54,598		100.0	70.9	29.1	29.1	
Maine	27,296	16,989	10,307	7,635	2,672	100.0	62.2	37.8	28.0	9.8
Maryland	49,973	27,978	21,995	17,518	4,477	100.0	56.0	44.1	25.1	9.0
Massachusetts	197,146	93,890	103,257	61,928	41,329	100.0	47.6	52.4	31.4	21.0
Michigan	208,966	78,510	130,456	77,091	53,365	100.0	37.6	62.4	36.9	25.5
Minnesota	108,947	47,040	61,907	21,169	40,738	100.0	43.2	56.8	19.4	37.4
Mississippi	56,388	44,684	11,705	11,336	369	100.0	79.2	20.8	20.1	.7
Missouri	146,227	95,209	51,019	50,704	315	100.0	65.1	94.9	34.7	.2
Montana	15,157	6,656	8,500	2,765	5,735	100.0	43.9	56.0	18.2	37.8
Nebraska	24,023	14,551	9,072	6,498	2,974	100.0	60.6	39.4	27.0	12.4
Nevada	7,849	3,239	4,610	2,071	2,539	100.0	41.3	58.7	26.4	32.3
New Hampshire	10,590	5,265	5,325	2,606	2,719	100.0	49.7	50.3	24.6	25.7
New Jersey	106,710	44,066	62,645	27,881	34,764	100.0	41.3	58.7	26.1	32.6
New Mexico	28,552	19,332	9,220	9,173	47	100.0	67.7	32.3	32.1	.2
New York	567,041	254,846	312,195	157,574	154,621	100.0	44.9	55.1	27.8	27.3
North Carolina	91,576	67,108	24,467	11,228	13,239	100.0	73.3	26.8	12.3	14.5
North Dakota	15,820	9,565	6,254	4,479	1,775	100.0	60.5	39.5	28.3	11.2
Ohio	227,085	107,987	119,097	97,061	22,036	100.0	47.6	52.4	42.7	9.7
Oklahoma	150,121	96,233	53,889	53,037	852	100.0	64.1	35.9	35.3	.6
Oregon	45,764	23,551	22,212	16,419	5,793	100.0	51.5	48.6	35.9	12.7
Pennsylvania	265,451	141,266	124,185	119,706	4,479	100.0	53.2	46.8	45.1	1.7
Rhode Island	24,705	12,332	12,373	11,358	1,015	100.0	49.9	50.1	46.0	4.1
South Carolina	33,842	25,570	8,272	7,874	398	100.0	75.6	24.5	23.3	1.2
South Dakota	14,961	9,501	5,460	3,987	1,473	100.0	63.5	36.5	26.7	9.8
Tennessee	61,542	47,454	14,088	10,944	3,144	100.0	77.1	22.9	17.8	5.1
Texas	229,668	167,231	62,437	59,604	2,833	100.0	72.8	27.2	26.0	1.2
Utah	22,231	14,336	7,895	7,877	18	100.0	64.5	35.5	35.4	.1
Vermont	9,387	6,410	2,977	2,052	925	100.0	68.3	31.8	21.9	9.9
Virginia	33,658	23,739	9,919	5,046	4,873	100.0	70.5	29.5	15.0	14.5
Washington	106,965	53,372	53,593	53,593		100.0	49.9	50.1	50.1	
West Virginia	60,422	44,841	15,581	15,133	448	100.0	74.2	25.7	25.0	.7
Wisconsin	85,273	37,407	47,866	21,896	25,970	100.0	43.9	56.2	25.7	30.5
Wyoming	6,327	3,127	3,200	1,472	1,728	100.0	49.4	50.6	23.3	27.3
District of Columbia	17,679	9,799	7,880	7,880		100.0	55.4	44.6	44.6	
Guam	294	152	142	142		100.0	51.7	48.3	48.3	
Puerto Rico	19,479	9,462	10,017	10,017		100.0	48.6	51.4	51.4	
Virgin Islands	748	317	431	431		100.0	42.4	57.6	57.6	

[1] Covers old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to blind, aid to permanently and totally disabled, medical assistance to the aged, and general assistance data which are available; includes administrative costs and vendor payments for medical care.
[2] Excludes Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Social Security Administration.

Total and per capita personal income by State, selected calendar years, 1929–63 [1]

State	Total personal income (millions)						Per capita personal income					
	[redacted]			[redacted]			[redacted]					
Total	$85,661	$72,753	$205,452	$381,326	$439,977	$461,610	$703	$556	$1,382	$2,163	$2,368	$2,449
Alabama	856	704	2,429	4,617	5,164	5,538	324	250	810	1,425	1,557	1,655
Alaska	(2)	(2)	(2)	555	661	704	(2)	(2)	(2)	2,523	2,731	2,839
Arizona	254	231	889	2,425	3,181	3,340	591	477	1,245	1,934	2,141	2,142
Arkansas	564	471	1,438	2,360	2,782	2,986	305	242	780	1,327	1,510	1,607
California	5,502	5,257	17,835	40,960	49,053	52,317	995	775	1,725	2,671	2,881	2,974
Colorado	642	578	1,794	3,769	4,618	4,831	637	516	1,385	2,182	2,440	2,464
Connecticut	1,641	1,415	3,452	6,873	8,069	8,490	1,029	834	1,699	2,755	3,074	3,185
Delaware	240	241	599	1,299	1,466	1,570	1,017	916	1,896	2,959	3,139	3,298
Florida	753	892	3,210	9,384	11,221	11,933	521	486	1,203	1,959	2,065	2,111
Georgia	1,015	967	3,098	6,079	7,145	7,715	350	310	932	1,558	1,750	1,864
Hawaii	(2)	218	685	1,290	1,587	1,667	(2)	525	1,354	2,118	2,394	2,462
Idaho	225	226	706	1,180	1,351	1,366	503	434	1,239	1,793	1,930	1,916
Illinois	7,280	5,566	14,654	25,693	28,895	30,020	957	705	1,690	2,576	2,861	2,948
Indiana	1,973	1,767	5,398	9,741	11,041	11,648	612	519	1,364	2,110	2,368	2,481
Iowa	1,419	1,183	3,403	5,412	6,075	6,399	577	469	1,320	1,972	2,190	2,302
Kansas	999	694	2,397	4,302	4,911	5,017	535	380	1,245	1,990	2,217	2,255
Kentucky	1,020	855	2,624	4,563	5,283	5,545	391	303	921	1,514	1,713	1,792
Louisiana	866	834	2,789	5,165	5,692	6,072	415	357	1,050	1,611	1,689	1,776
Maine	479	417	1,061	1,717	1,918	1,971	601	493	1,175	1,792	1,961	2,007
Maryland	1,260	1,186	3,384	7,133	8,555	9,163	777	661	1,453	2,338	2,646	2,786
Massachusetts	3,862	3,162	7,066	12,381	14,269	14,889	913	727	1,490	2,436	2,750	2,853
Michigan	3,803	3,215	9,522	17,467	19,264	20,624	793	624	1,504	2,253	2,399	2,541
Minnesota	1,539	1,432	3,810	6,706	7,712	8,152	598	517	1,298	1,985	2,228	2,329
Mississippi	570	444	1,391	2,490	2,906	3,183	285	205	667	1,152	1,285	1,390
Missouri	2,275	1,914	5,219	9,260	10,385	10,900	628	506	1,344	2,161	2,406	2,518
Montana	312	294	791	1,328	1,558	1,553	595	530	1,390	1,991	2,235	2,197
Nebraska	811	521	1,699	2,788	3,319	3,376	590	395	1,305	1,989	2,295	2,312
Nevada	79	90	276	759	1,104	1,246	878	841	1,758	2,720	3,154	3,386
New Hampshire	322	274	663	1,201	1,394	1,450	690	559	1,244	1,995	2,241	2,313
New Jersey	3,714	3,100	7,930	15,499	18,073	18,861	931	751	1,622	2,601	2,843	2,915
New Mexico	171	184	717	1,688	1,888	1,953	407	352	1,113	1,819	1,894	1,918
New York	14,105	11,152	26,144	45,197	51,243	53,361	1,159	825	1,756	2,720	2,929	3,013
North Carolina	1,046	1,111	3,596	6,716	8,177	8,601	334	316	919	1,492	1,738	1,807
North Dakota	253	202	678	986	1,400	1,300	375	314	1,136	1,573	2,212	2,050
Ohio	5,178	4,265	11,736	21,977	24,215	25,164	781	619	1,472	2,286	2,412	2,474
Oklahoma	1,077	805	2,432	4,083	4,675	4,858	454	345	1,155	1,774	1,910	1,953
Oregon	647	629	2,235	3,845	4,324	4,568	683	582	1,562	2,190	2,393	2,502
Pennsylvania	7,531	5,933	14,771	24,757	27,015	28,017	775	599	1,422	2,204	2,373	2,452
Rhode Island	596	500	1,173	1,832	2,082	2,153	871	713	1,464	2,145	2,371	2,433
South Carolina	470	511	1,700	3,142	3,745	3,944	270	273	838	1,327	1,530	1,588
South Dakota	288	219	690	1,027	1,460	1,390	417	340	1,084	1,513	2,025	1,886
Tennessee	982	886	2,992	5,346	6,184	6,588	377	308	925	1,507	1,693	1,783
Texas	2,752	2,600	9,778	18,132	20,437	21,351	478	409	1,283	1,918	2,019	2,068
Utah	284	251	821	1,630	1,999	2,083	559	462	1,224	1,859	2,087	2,119
Vermont	225	172	414	697	794	827	627	480	1,122	1,806	2,052	2,121
Virginia	1,054	1,127	3,626	7,043	8,399	8,907	435	422	1,101	1,793	1,977	2,057
Washington	1,166	1,058	3,641	6,372	7,426	7,575	750	617	1,587	2,257	2,467	2,484
West Virginia	794	723	2,050	3,060	3,224	3,348	462	387	1,062	1,635	1,795	1,883
Wisconsin	2,001	1,615	4,614	8,310	9,291	9,617	682	517	1,361	2,123	2,312	2,368
Wyoming	151	145	440	720	810	834	677	585	1,588	2,215	2,440	2,475
District of Columbia	615	735	1,677	2,215	2,537	2,645	1,273	1,117	2,078	2,888	3,215	3,315

[1] Personal income by State is the current income received by residents of the States from all sources, inclusive of transfers from government and business but exclusive of transfers among persons. Total personal income for all States differs from total personal income of the United States in that the latter includes income disbursed by the Federal Government to its civilian and military personnel outside the United States.

[2] Not available.

Source: Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics.

Public elementary and secondary school expenditures by State, [1] *selected school years, 1945–46 to 1961–62*

[In thousands]

State	1945–46	1949–50	1955–56	1959–60	1961–62	State	1945–46	1949–50	1955–56	1959–60	1961–62
Total [2]	$2,906,886	$5,837,643	$10,955,047	$15,613,255	$18,338,487	Nevada	$3,427	$8,757	$21,638	$32,641	$43,872
Alabama	39,054	79,374	134,070	191,165	200,779	New Hampshire	8,154	16,939	29,559	41,114	51,283
Alaska				24,195	31,894	New Jersey	120,017	199,986	399,[redacted]007		702,683
Arizona	14,840	41,535	83,138	139,697	171,261	New Mexico	13,820	33,509	73,640	88,902	115,198
Arkansas	22,959	54,354	71,690	100,548	121,438	New York	351,711	617,811	1,256,339	1,742,717	2,055,891
California	221,435	623,359	1,280,350	2,021,625	2,396,124	North Carolina	63,477	151,323	225,311	294,744	374,437
Colorado	25,861	59,458	126,061	189,508	214,927	North Dakota	14,594	24,905	41,687	59,694	69,897
Connecticut	41,174	83,748	156,406	231,407	275,926	Ohio	158,379	291,920	573,343	799,953	932,380
Delaware	5,724	13,118	29,604	55,667	53,134	Oklahoma	45,467	87,611	150,036	185,751	200,456
Florida	38,970	97,319	226,826	367,207	438,159	Oregon	31,651	93,325	136,818	185,229	214,288
Georgia	46,102	95,225	166,676	236,764	285,494	Pennsylvania	205,379	348,118	584,052	797,498	927,726
Hawaii				48,766	57,921	Rhode Island	13,929	21,538	37,350	53,035	68,600
Idaho	11,687	26,267	42,964	52,527	60,777	South Carolina	28,959	63,465	141,732	136,686	159,941
Illinois	178,815	358,198	627,899	846,734	989,521	South Dakota	15,683	27,071	44,392	53,855	65,483
Indiana	81,692	158,180	260,008	393,626	477,022	Tennessee	39,596	104,576	155,927	214,459	241,485
Iowa	59,525	114,174	186,992	235,678	287,179	Texas	138,465	303,013	546,691	757,092	894,409
Kansas	41,500	72,391	157,982	216,003	235,378	Utah	17,897	33,800	68,861	97,490	114,405
Kentucky	38,033	68,092	96,995	148,236	202,608	Vermont	6,520	11,548	21,024	28,144	32,240
Louisiana	39,991	112,753	191,806	298,618	300,224	Virginia	47,840	100,920	188,478	266,942	329,001
Maine	14,769	25,143	39,911	59,674	75,284	Washington	59,661	113,845	225,113	319,393	385,167
Maryland	35,116	94,545	186,622	286,550	345,086	West Virginia	40,108	69,666	96,059	122,434	138,815
Massachusetts	93,224	124,559	272,537	368,907	441,525	Wisconsin	69,861	123,868	244,225	332,960	410,895
Michigan	134,015	274,534	581,448	811,973	919,987	Wyoming	7,661	14,737	35,114	46,844	48,300
Minnesota	64,667	118,163	258,676	352,448	404,969	District of Columbia	14,031	27,871	38,060	52,752	60,381
Mississippi	21,080	40,786	81,329	148,791	151,189						
Missouri	78,573	112,463	222,219	300,749	363,007	Alaska	1,391	4,101	13,093		
Montana	18,316	31,607	51,722	64,021	74,191	Hawaii	12,712	19,412	30,551		
Nebraska	29,478	47,193	86,539	112,836	126,250						

[1] Includes current expenditures, capital outlay, and interest for public day schools, expenditures for operation of summer and adult programs, community services, and community colleges.

[2] Beginning in 1959–60, totals include Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Average annual salaries of instructional staff [1] in public elementary and secondary day schools by State, selected school years 1945–46—1961–62

State	1945–46	1949–50	1955–56	1959–60	1961–62	State	1945–46	1949–50	1955–56	1959–60	1961–62
Total [2]	$1,995	$3,000	$4,156	$5,174	[3] $5,700	Nebraska	$1,514	$2,292	$3,171	$3,876	$4,470
						Nevada	1,992	3,209	4,496	5,693	6,157
Alabama	1,276	2,111	3,386	4,002	4,071	New Hampshire	1,530	2,712	3,510	4,455	4,861
Alaska				[4] 6,859	[4] 7,285	New Jersey	2,561	3,511	4,747	[7] 5,871	6,285
Arizona	2,167	3,556	4,472	5,590	6,190	New Mexico	1,970	3,215	4,492	5,382	5,700
Arkansas	1,068	1,801	2,378	3,295	3,685	New York	2,946	3,706	5,277	6,537	6,941
California	2,987	[5]	5,243	[3] 6,600	[3] 7,100	North Carolina	1,602	2,688	3,400	4,178	5,190
Colorado	1,822	2,821	4,012	4,997	5,349	North Dakota	1,469	2,324	[7] 2,929	3,695	4,192
Connecticut	2,393	3,558	4,730	6,008	6,770	Ohio	2,165	3,088	4,337	5,124	5,554
Delaware	2,202	3,273	4,561	[3] 5,800	6,303	Oklahoma	1,796	2,736	3,703	4,659	4,997
Florida	1,719	2,958	[6] 4,130	5,080	5,624	Oregon	2,164	3,323	4,423	5,535	[3] 6,100
Georgia	1,081	1,963	3,161	3,904	4,494	Pennsylvania	2,124	3,006	4,400	5,308	5,733
Hawaii				5,390	5,551	Rhode Island	2,098	3,294	4,442	[7] 5,499	5,903
Idaho	1,672	2,481	3,550	4,216	4,479	South Carolina	1,152	1,891	3,005	3,450	3,865
Illinois	2,280	3,458	[7] 4,757	[7] 5,184	[3] 6,300	South Dakota	1,530	2,064	2,943	3,725	4,138
Indiana	2,143	3,401	4,376	5,542	6,409	Tennessee	1,287	2,302	3,156	3,929	4,190
Iowa	1,676	2,420	3,181	[3] 4,030	5,001	Texas	1,640	3,122	3,983	4,708	5,379
Kansas	1,666	2,628	3,673	[3] 4,450	4,925	Utah	2,016	3,103	3,922	5,096	5,337
Kentucky	1,295	1,936	2,698	3,327	4,427	Vermont	1,692	2,348	3,105	4,466	4,997
Louisiana	1,537	2,983	3,885	4,978	5,282	Virginia	1,574	2,328	3,422	4,312	4,824
Maine	1,409	2,115	2,881	3,694	4,288	Washington	2,547	3,487	4,554	[7] 5,643	6,190
Maryland	2,262	3,594	4,513	5,557	6,242	West Virginia	1,676	2,425	3,112	3,952	4,432
Massachusetts	2,512	3,338	4,337	[7] 5,545	5,850	Wisconsin	2,002	3,007	4,127	[8] 4,870	[8] 5,709
Michigan	2,337	3,420	4,711	5,654	6,022	Wyoming	1,654	2,798	3,851	4,937	5,546
Minnesota	1,878	3,013	4,121	5,275	5,816	District of Columbia	2,637	3,920	5,394	6,280	6,664
Mississippi	856	1,416	2,436	3,314	3,637						
Missouri	1,793	2,581	3,520	4,536	5,143	Alaska	2,655	4,268	5,431		
Montana	1,838	2,962	3,633	[7] 4,425	4,977	Hawaii	2,795	3,508	4,230		

[1] Includes supervisors, principals, teachers, and other instructional staff.
[2] Beginning in 1959–60, totals include Alaska and Hawaii.
[3] Estimated by Office of Education.
[4] Because of the high cost of living, data for Alaska cannot readily be compared with those for other States.
[5] Not available.
[6] Includes teachers in junior colleges.
[7] Includes some personnel in addition to instructional staff.
[8] Excludes vocational schools not operated as part of the regular public school system

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Local long-term debt outstanding by unit of government, and school debt by State, end of fisca' year 1962

[In thousands]

Purpose and State	All units	Counties	Municipalities	School districts	Townships	Special districts
	A. All purposes					
Total debt	$55,455,581	$5,208,329	$25,098,929	$13,656,448	$1,303,386	$10,188,490
Schools	18,119,401	1,056,017	1,892,212	13,656,448	578,113	938,119
Utilities	12,280,170	1,101	8,880,305		160,057	3,237,310
Other	25,056,010	4,151,211	14,326,412		565,216	6,013,061
	B. School purposes by State					
Alabama	$109,449	$3,388	$59,134	$46,927		
Alaska	35,389		542	34,847		
Arizona	149,458			149,458		
Arkansas	110,907			110,907		
California	2,160,983		44,322	2,116,661		
Colorado	250,931			250,931		
Connecticut	360,229		112,306	12,859	$235,064	
Delaware	44,015		3,855	40,160		
Florida	293,162			293,162		
Georgia	164,378	19,111	40,747	104,521		
Hawaii	12,751	801	11,950			
Idaho	56,027			56,027		
Illinois	1,119,229			1,119,229		
Indiana	298,717			125,830	172,887	
Iowa	241,150			241,150		
Kansas	228,710			228,710		
Kentucky	186,414	370	21,219	164,826		
Louisiana	372,223		7,710	364,513		
Maine	48,058		21,177	8,862	18,018	
Maryland	423,374	316,832	106,542			

Purpose and State	All units	Counties	Municipalities	School districts	Townships	Special districts
	B. School purposes by State—Continued					
Massachusetts	$423,048	$335	$130,986	$41,251	$250,476	
Michigan	862,289		3,066	859,223		
Minnesota	528,295	4,325	26,094	497,876		
Mississippi	103,706			103,706		
Missouri	366,467			366,467		
Montana	62,273		92	62,181		
Nebraska	113,828		3,004	110,825		
Nevada	53,291			53,291		
New Hampshire	47,874		20,402	27,472		
New Jersey	754,953	2,295	172,483	562,456	17,720	
New Mexico	40,956			40,956		
New York	2,548,997	7,854	691,137	1,826,031	23,974	
North Carolina	259,544	259,544				
North Dakota	51,535			51,535		
Ohio	1,047,868		17,181	1,030,687		
Oklahoma	127,225	2,855		124,370		
Oregon	135,479			135,479		
Pennsylvania	1,065,555			300,796		$764,759
Rhode Island	66,263		42,530	1,731	22,002	
South Carolina	45,537	4		45,533		
South Dakota	27,815			27,815		
Tennessee	275,034	215,142	57,490	2,403		
Texas	1,195,955		13,323	1,182,633		
Utah	80,515			80,515		
Vermont	20,875		3,819	6,546	10,510	
Virginia	314,907	223,316	91,591			
Washington	285,990			285,990		
West Virginia	58,985			58,985		
Wisconsin	446,450		189,556	256,893		
Wyoming	42,338			42,338		

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman in the well knows full well that one of the purposes of Public Law 874 is the payment in lieu of taxes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, we have heard that argument before; and I refuse to yield any further. We have gone through that.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to set the record straight immediately after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] has finished speaking.

The gentleman from Illinois fully knows, but has chosen not to tell his colleagues, that in Public Law 874 the poor States of the Nation, if their local expenditures for education are not as great as the State average, they receive the State average. And, if the State average is not as great as the national average, they receive the national average.

In the case of the State of Alabama under Public Law 874 they receive the national average.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The gentleman knows——

Mr. QUIE. I have not yielded to the gentleman from Illinois. I would like the gentleman from Illinois to yield to me as I did to the gentleman yesterday. After the gentleman starts doing that I shall yield to him again.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think the record ought to be straight as to the effect of Public Law 874 which has for its purpose the payment to school districts of amounts in lieu of taxes, because the people who live on or work on a Federal

establishment do not pay the property taxes on that property.

There are some cases as in Fairfax County in Virginia and Montgomery County in Maryland where Federal employees pay taxes but these counties are receiving aid under the impacted areas bill for these same people. There is about $150 million which goes down the drain in that boondoggle. The amendment which I have proposed in prior years should be supported although the gentleman from Illinois does not choose to support such an amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2362.

Mr. Chairman, my State of Minnesota has developed over the years one of the finest educational systems in the United States. We in the North Star State are justly proud of what we have done to provide the very best in educational opportunities for our young people. As a high measure of our educational attainment, studies have shown that Minnesota ranks eighth of all the States in the percent of selective service registrants failing the mental test.

In the school year 1963–64, the 3,016 public elementary and secondary schools in Minnesota had 739,735 students enrolled. The per pupil expenditure amounted to $468. Only nine other States stood higher than that in that particular school year.

Now, I know Mr. Chairman, the argument will be used that other States are not as able to provide for their students—that they have peculiar economic problems. Well I might remind my colleagues that Minnesota too has an acute economic problem on our Iron Range, as well as other financial problems. But despite this, Minnesota has taken sufficient interest in providing a sound educational system to the point where only nine other States do better than Minnesota in per pupil expenditure.

The Minnesota Legislature has also established a loan program for school construction in areas where there is a proven need.

Minnesota also ranks high in the salaries paid to our teachers as well as several other criteria used in ranking a State's educational program.

And we have 34 universities, colleges and junior colleges, church, State or privately owned and operated.

We are proud of what we have done, basically through State and local government, to build this system. We do not need or want Federal aid and control for "impoverished children." We will do it ourselves.

We do not need or want Federal aid and control to buy books and other library materials. We will do it ourselves.

We do not need or want Federal aid and control for communitywide supplemental educational centers which bypass our State board of education. We will take care of these needs ourselves.

We do not need or want Federal aid and control to provide grants to our State board of education. The Minnesota Legislature can appropriate these funds, and does.

Mr. Chairman, the only two major provisions of this bill which I can in all good conscience support are the provisions for improving educational research and for the continuation of the impacted aid program. These two programs are national in scope and are legitimate concerns of the Federal Government.

The first provision of this bill, the one calling for aid to the poorer schoolchildren throughout America, is the one which has attracted the most interest, both before the bill came to the floor and in these recent hours. Everyone, of course, is interested in improving educational opportunities for our lowest income groups throughout America. But under the guise of helping impoverished children, this section amounts to a generalized program of Federal aid to education.

Minnesota would receive a little over $20 million in Federal aid under this first provision. The Internal Revenue Service, in response to my request, had advised me that Minnesotans would pay almost $30 million in taxes for this $20 million in benefits.

Residents of Anoka and Hennepin Counties, Minn., the only two in my Third Congressional District, would pay about $7 million in taxes to finance this program, but would receive only $2⅓ million in benefits.

Anoka County would receive $139,000 out of the $19 million allotted to the State. That amounts to less than 1 percent of the total.

Mr. Chairman, Anoka County receives 6 percent of the total State aids which the State of Minnesota, through its allocation system, pays out each year. Surely the State of Minnesota knows far better than the Federal Government how school funds should be allocated within Minnesota.

But let us take this one step further. Anoka County presently receives a bit more than 4 percent of the Federal funds which now come into the State of Minnesota for educational purposes. Now, Mr. Speaker, how misguided can we be?

Here we have the Federal Government sending funds into Minnesota under such programs as Smith-Hughes, George Barden, school lunch, National Defense—titles III and V, Civil Defense, Public Laws 815 and 874, and Johnson O'Malley which figures out to 4 percent for the county of Anoka. And now we are asked to consider an education bill which is supposed to be based on need which allocates less than 1 percent for Anoka County.

Mr. Chairman, outside of the basic disagreements I have with Federal aid to elementary and secondary education, I now find that this bill—this grandiose Great Society scheme for education—does not even have an allocation formula which makes sense.

Palm Beach County, Fla., with 6,663 children in the requisite category, is scheduled to receive $1,292,622 under the terms of title I of this bill. Westchester County, N.Y., one of the richest counties in the country and one with 400 less children affected, will receive $2,189,026 in aid. Mr. Chairman, the median family income for Palm Beach County, Fla., is $4,784. The median family income for Westchester County, N.Y., is $8,052.

Under terms of this bill the average impoverished child in Palm Beach County, Fla., will receive $194. In Westchester County, N.Y., each child will be credited with aid amounting to $352. Palm Beach County will receive almost 10 times as much, and Westchester County 15 times as much as Anoka County, Minn.

The House has already seen the figures of the comparison between the 10 richest and 10 poorest counties in the Nation and the effect this bill will have. The above are but further examples of what is wrong with this bill. It violates the concept of fairplay while being heralded as a great boon to impoverished children. There are better approaches to improving the quality of education in America. Bills which implement these approaches are pending in this House. They should be given a hearing.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, for her excellent remarks here today. There have been those happiness boys who have read the committee estimates of fund distribution, made fancy press releases, but forgot to look behind the fancy figures and examine the formula.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot forget the fact that a poor child in the State of North Dakota is as deserving of help as a poor child in the State of Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] says it costs about $504 to educate a child in Illinois, and about half of that in one of the poorer States of America. He cannot deny that education is poorer generally in the poorer States than in the wealthy States, and this is the heart of the matter. This is what needs correction.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow this Nation's children to be frozen into an arbitrary formula where the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

This is our main objection to this bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of H.R. 2362.

I want to say at the outset that I was one of those who in the beginning had some serious misgivings about the formula included in the bill. One of the things that caused me concern with respect to the formula was the information put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 24 by the Honorable WILLIAM H. AYRES of our committee with respect to the amounts of money given to the 10 wealthiest counties as compared to the amounts of money allocated to the 10 poorest counties.

Perhaps, the reason why I focus my attention on this so much is because one of those counties is located in my district. I represent the entire State. I have an interest, not only in the subur-

ban area of Washington in which I live, but in the entire State.

I certainly would not want to support a bill that would be so unreasonable as to unjustly enrich Montgomery County at the expense of the poor students who also live in my district, in the hard-core area of Baltimore, or those who live in the Appalachia region in the western end of my State.

You will recall that the table listed 10 selected wealthy counties and 10 selected poor counties in the United States according to median family income and showed that the number of children in families under $2,000 was about equal—that is, 32,000—but that the 10 wealthy counties received approximately twice the total amount of money that the poor counties received. This is purported to prove that the administration's proposal to aid disadvantaged children is designed to give support where it is least needed.

What the table in fact illustrates—and this is all it illustrates—is that when payments are related to State average expenditures, the payments per child in one State will be twice the payments per child in another State if the latter State is only spending half as much per child as the former. This is essentially what is involved in the States where the counties listed are located.

If the administration bill were a general aid proposal based upon equalization principles, then the criteria cited in the table would be relevant. The proposal is, however, categorical aid designed to benefit educationally disadvantaged children. It is designed to aid such children wherever they are found, whether in poor, average, or wealthy counties.

One of the premises of this legislation is that it takes extra expenditures of money to remove the disadvantages of these children. Most school districts, whether wealthy or poor, find it difficult to spend extra sums for poor children in their district, and it is these extra expenditures that are vitally needed. With special Federal funds specifically earmarked for aid to the disadvantaged, little objection can be raised within the district since funds are not, obviously, being taken from one child to be spent on another.

Another point might also be made. In virtually all State special aid programs, such as those for the blind or physically handicapped, for example, funds are supplied by the States to cover the extra costs of such programs in all districts. It is generally felt that no district, regardless of wealth, should have to support these programs once the State has assumed responsibility.

Cultural or educational disadvantage is being recognized by this legislation as a special category of concern by the Federal Government.

If we were to try to draw a line above which no county or school district could receive aid for its disadvantaged children, where would we draw it? Should we say that all counties or school districts with a median family income above the national average cannot qualify? The national median family income in 1959 was $5,660. This would exclude the following cities with above-average median family income: Detroit, Mich., $6,069; New York, N.Y., $6,091; Akron, Ohio, $6,466; and Chicago, Ill., $6,738.

But the need for special aid in these cities is enormous.

Nor can it be said that we propose to help the wealthy counties listed at the expense of the poorer counties. Note that while the number of disadvantaged children in the two groups are the same, the total enrollment and population in the wealthy counties are over 10 times that in the poor counties. While it is not possible to estimate precisely the amount of Federal taxes contributed by each of the groups, a conservative estimate would show the wealthy group contributing 40 to 50 times as much as the poorer group.

They are certainly paying many times over what they receive. The poorer counties, in turn, are receiving many times over what they pay. It seems to me it is with little grace when we say to these counties that are paying substantially into the program that they have caught their finger in the cookie jar when they want to receive back under the formula established to help depressed areas even in these wealthy counties.

The use of the State average expenditure per pupil was placed in the legislation to compensate for the higher costs of education in the industrial and urban areas and to effect the income "in kind" of farm areas. Under these conditions, it was felt that a 50-percent increase in the per pupil expenditures for disadvantaged children would have the same relative effect wherever they are found. A flat rate figure would have the effect of either being inadequate in many instances if it is kept low or providing an unreasonable and unmanageable increase if kept at a medium rate.

The amount of money being distributed under the present plan would amount to less than 1 percent of Montgomery County, Maryland's school budget, but would increase Tunica County, Mississippi's school budget by 58 percent in the first year. We question whether such a short-range increase could be properly digested in terms of educational expenditures and so Tunica County's budget increase is limited by the legislation to 30 percent in fiscal 1966.

What we have witnessed in the presentation of a selected top and a selected bottom 10 counties is a study in extremes which has ignored the 3,000 counties in between. This legislation was not designed to aid only poor counties. It was designed to aid disadvantaged children wherever they live, whether in a rural or urban slum or in pockets of poverty in wealthy communities. There are such places as Toby Town in Montgomery County, and Gum Spring in Fairfax County, two of the wealthiest counties in the table.

We propose a bill which is equitable, and this legislation meets that criterion. Let us not assess it on the basis of something it is not. It is not a foundation or equalization program. It is a program which will make a major contribution toward removing the educational disadvantages suffered by children in poverty and assure them equal opportunity to seek a full life in our society.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. The formula proposed for distribution of the funds authorized in the bill can be reviewed next year; can it not?

Mr. SICKLES. Yes, it can, and it is the plan of the chairman to do so.

Mr. LANDRUM. Under the formula this plan for distribution of these funds is not to be construed as a permanent method of distributing these funds?

Mr. SICKLES. That is exactly right.

Mr. LANDRUM. So if the Committee on Education and Labor and the Commissioner of Education and the States and local election boards exceed the program discussed in the first year of operation and find there are inequities in the formula for distributing the funds, the Congress will have an opportunity next year to review that formula.

Mr. SICKLES. That is exactly right. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I should like to congratulate the gentleman on making such an excellent presentation of the question.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that while I, too, have some misgivings about the formula, I must be frank and recognize that there is a need indeed for some aid to our educational system. I certainly agree with the majority that the educationally deprived child, the needy child, and the dropouts particularly, are the ones that deserve and should get this needed education.

I read with interest, as I am sure all of you have, the suggested plans and programs on page 6 of the report.

This is one time that I am sorry the Federal Government left the decision up to the local agencies. I would hope that all of this money could have been concentrated on such programs as special classes for the physically handicapped, the disturbed, the socially maladjusted child, for preschool training programs, for remedial programs, for programs for early identification and prevention of dropouts, for increased guidance, so that we on the Federal level could get to the root and to the causes of the problems.

But I think it is about time we begin to talk frankly in this Committee of the Whole House about what this bill does not do and what it purports to do.

I may be in error, but I think in answer to the gentleman from Illinois as to the reason why we do not use the formula in Public Law 784 and why we do not give this money to the local school boards to use as they see fit and why we directed this aid to the educationally deprived child—the reason we do that, as I understand it, is to come under the

constitutional approval of aid to the schools as is outlined in the Supreme Court case of Everson versus Board of Education.

In other words, the purpose of this is to give the aid to the child. It is the "child benefit theory." Otherwise, if that were not the case, we could give this money directly to the board of education.

Since we are using the child benefit theory under the Everson case which all of you know is the schoolbus case that originated in New Jersey whereby children from parochial schools were permitted to be transported at public expense to parochial schools on the theory that it benefited the child—and since that is the theory of this bill, I want to know why is there such a reluctance on the part of the committee to admit that the purpose of this bill is to help the children who go to private schools just as much as—and equally—and the same as the children who go to the public schools?

I want to know why is there a limitation on that help? Why is it limited to specialized services? Why do not the children who go to the private schools, if this is the theory of the bill—the child benefit theory—why do they not get the same equal treatment? For certainly, it cannot be denied that needy children go to private schools. It cannot be denied that dropouts go to private schools. It cannot be denied that service rejects go to private schools. So why then if the purpose of this bill is to help the needy, the reject, and the dropout, and if it is based upon the constitutional permissive, approved theory of the child-benefit program—why cannot the committee recognize and admit that the child who goes to the private school is entitled to the same treatment and the same care as the child who does not go to a private school?

This is what I want to know because I have been told by many of my friends and my colleagues whose judgment I respect that actually it does provide that; that the funds are for the benefit of the needy—that the funds are for the benefit of all children regardless of the school, and that this is the reason for this bill. All I want to know is—why do not we put this in the RECORD? Will the Chairman say this for the RECORD? Will not the Member in charge of the bill, the chairman of the subcommittee, make the legislative history here? I can say to you that this is spelled out in the report because on page 7 of the report, you will see in the next to the last paragraph these words:

> Thus, the bill does anticipate broadened instructional offerings under publicly sponsored auspices which will be available to elementary and secondary school students who are not enrolled in public schools.

Again, on page 16, under title III of the bill, we find, in the next to the last paragraph, these words:

> Criteria developed in the title provide that the Federal funds could not be used to supplant funds normally available to the localities, that the money granted to local public educational agencies would be used for programs accessible—

And these are the key words—

> to all appropriate children in the area to be served irrespective of their school enrollment, and that local educational agencies will utilize the best available talents and resources in the area to be served.

I submit that the purpose of the legislation, as it was written, is constitutional. I submit that the desire of the committee is to give the aid to all children who are qualified. Therefore, I do not understand why there is a reluctance on the part of the chairman of the subcommittee to say so for the RECORD.

Therefore, I want to ask him a question. Do the criteria which are set forth in title III of this bill apply to title I of the bill; and, therefore, is it intended that the money in title I is to be used subject to State law in an equal amount among all educationally deprived and needy children of whatever school they attend? Will the gentleman answer that "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. PERKINS. I will not answer the question "Yes" or "No."

Mr. CAHILL. Then I do not yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Because it cannot be. Let me answer the question.

Mr. CAHILL. I do not yield.

Mr. PERKINS. The bill speaks for itself.

Mr. CAHILL. I should like to propose the question to another Member. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], if he will answer the question.

In your judgment, is the money in title I intended to be used subject to State law equally among all educationally deprived and needy children regardless of the school they attend? Will you answer that question "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. REID of New York. I would say to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey that in my judgment, subject to State law and to the approval of the State under title I and to the programs submitted by the local educational agency or agencies, it is clear that funds for some of the illustrative purposes the gentleman mentioned are to be applied for all educationally deprived children within the low-income district as prescribed and defined by the bill. It is my understanding there is not to be any difference between those in a nonpublic school and those in public school. In a broad sense, I believe the answer to the question is that there is not to be any distinction.

Mr. CAHILL. And, therefore, the funds are to be used equally.

Mr. REID of New York. That is my understanding of the intent of the legislation subject to the various caveats I have mentioned and that are in the several titles in the bill. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. CAHILL. Very well. Does the chairman of the subcommittee agree with the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to state that the bill speaks for itself. The gentleman has been addressing himself to two titles, and reading from the report on title III, which is certainly separate and apart from title I.

In title I under broadened public school offerings of special educational services are provided for the nonpublic school children, the private schoolchildren. In title III, the publicly operated educational centers, bring educational innovations and demonstrative educational programs and services in which not only the public school pupil but also the nonpublic school pupil can participate.

Mr. CAHILL. If I may have the gentleman's attention, in response I say I recognize the difference between title I and title III, and I concede under title III the aid is specifically spelled out and that there is no doubt, in my judgment, at least, that under title III children who attend private schools are entitled to equal treatment. But I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is only $100 million appropriated or authorized under title III whereas there is $1 billion X million under title I. My question is this: do the criteria established in title III also apply with equal force to title I? That is my question.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I addressed myself to title III yesterday and the gentleman will recall that he and I had a colloquy on a related point and I referred him to page 5750 of the RECORD.

Mr. CAHILL. Yes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. However, in response to the gentleman's question, if I understand it correctly, the answer is that the criteria set forth in the bill on pages 106 through 109—and on page 109 is the particular criteria to which the gentleman refers in title III—those criteria apply to that title and the criteria set forth in title I apply to that title.

Mr. CAHILL. But my question is—and if I may say too, it was really the gentleman's very frank and reassuring statement that sent me back to the bill last night—I find in my judgment that the things the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON, assured me were in the bill were provided for specifically in title III. That is the special help and special therapists. That is all in title III. There is no doubt about that. But my question is this: is that same type of aid available under title I where all of the money is?

Mr. BRADEMAS. If the gentleman will read title I and consult the colloquy yesterday, there are a series of possible uses for the title I funds. The gentleman will be clearer in our discussions if he will not try to mix the two titles, because title I is the only title of this bill which is specifically directed toward meeting the problems of educationally deprived children.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota to answer the question.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, if we read on page 5758 of the RECORD the answer that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] gave yesterday, it indicates there that under title I only special type programs will be available for the private

schools and he talks about such things as guidance counselors, speech therapists, and remedial reading specialists and says specifically that general course teachers will not be available for the private schools. But today we hear they are all available.

It was established by the chairman of the committee yesterday that the general courses are available only for the public schools. Looking on page 6 of the report, additional teaching personnel to reduce class size and any teachers they need—but the gentleman from New Jersey yesterday stated specifically they would not be included, as did the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. We have an altogether different answer today.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I might say that the gentleman is correct. I stated specifically and categorically what I believe to be the situation. The gentlemen from Kentucky and New York agreed. Unhappily, though, on page 5758 of the RECORD it was incorrectly reported. If the gentleman will yield me enough time to reread it correctly, you will see I have answered it.

Mr. QUIE. Could you get some time from your side on this? This is an important matter, and we are just about out of our time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. May I have 3 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. QUIE. With the understanding that the gentleman from New Jersey will be yielded 2 minutes from the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey to read his statement. This is correct, that you will get 2 additional minutes?

Mr. POWELL. I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (reading):

Services and arrangements provided for nonpublic school students must be special as distinguished from general educational assistance.

The decision about the best arrangement for providing special educational assistance under title I is left to the public education agency of the school district, under the constitution and laws of the State.

Thus, public school boards could make available the services of such special personnel as guidance counselors, speech therapists, remedial reading specialists, school social workers who would reach the nonpublic schoolchildren——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (continuing):

school social workers who would reach the nonpublic school children in the public schools or through public services in the nonpublic school buildings, or through mobile services, or through ETV, or through community centers, et cetera. But these special services would not be part of the regular instructional program of the nonpublic schools. Thus, nonpublic schools could not get general classroom teachers in history, English, mathematics, and social studies.

This is where the error was in yesterday's RECORD at page 5758. It should be noted:

That States like New York and California which have very strict constitutional prohibitions on aid to private schools still do permit special services of the type mentioned. This legislation, therefore, respects State and local autonomy and judgment.

It should also be pointed out that shared time—instruction in the public schools under public school control—now goes on in 35 States. Thus, it already occurs with greater frequency than suggested by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The 35 States are: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CAHILL. Then it is the gentleman's considered opinion that the statement which he very kindly presented to me last evening and which he reaffirms today has application to all of the funds authorized in title I of this bill as well as to the funds in title III of the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No, only in title I.

Mr. CAHILL. Only in title I?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. CAHILL. If the gentleman will yield further, I call his attention to page 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished member of our committee the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY].

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, we are at present considering a bill for Federal aid to education, a bill which has been called a historic "first" in this country. But this bill is also a reaffirmation of this country's continuing commitment to the education of our people.

Almost 200 years ago, before our great Nation had even adopted a Constitution, the Continental Congress declared that "Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." This present education bill allows us to continue, in 1965, to fulfill that declaration which was made in 1787.

I do not believe there is really any debate today, nor has been in the entire history of our great Nation, on the question of whether or not there should be public aid to education. The debate today, and throughout our history, has rather been on the question of what kind of aid.

In this context it is clear that as the representatives of the American people we have a duty to continually reexamine what kind of educational encouragement and aid we are providing for our people and to evaluate whether it is "the right kind at the right time."

After much study Commissioner Keppel recommended to the President, and President Johnson presented to this Congress, a bill which points the way to a solution of today's problems in education. The most significant part of the proposed legislation, as all have recognized, is emphasis on providing special Federal aid to the children from poor and welfare families.

This new departure must be our answer to our new awareness that our educational system has failed over the years to provide equal education to rich and poor children. This failure is not a minor one, it is not one which I will fatalistically accept; it goes to the root of our entire history of free, public education. For the guiding principle underlying the idea of free, public education is that no child should be denied an education because he cannot afford a private education. We have allowed deviations from the basic premise; we have allowed, in fact, a difference in educational opportunities for rich and poor children.

This bill which is before us today is a commitment to return to the basic premise of our educational system. I unreservedly support that commitment.

This afternoon an amendment will be offered to the bill which will, I believe, strengthen that commitment. The amendment, which I shall support, would provide that the entire amount of money requested under title I be divided by the total number of poor and welfare children, and that the resulting figure, about $200, be the basis for distributing funds under title I. This change is from the present formula which uses as a basis for the aid the per pupil expenditure of each of our 50 States.

I believe the proposed amendment is a crucial one, it is crucial for the basic concept of equal education for all, for just as we believe that a child should not be penalized because he comes from a poor family, I believe a child should not be penalized because he lives in a poor State.

If Johnny's father has a low income and little property, and therefore pays little in taxes which are used to support his State's educational system, is it fair to penalize Johnny by providing his school less Federal funds for his education than are provided to the schools in a rich State? I do not believe the American credo of free, equal, public education would allow this.

In fact, the present formula would be a penalty for past errors, for a past crime of omission. For if a State in the past has been unable to provide sufficient funds for education we would be penalizing it in the future by giving that same State less money. I believe this kind of "ex post facto" judgment must be stricken from the bill.

Our commitment to public education is one of the underlying strengths of this Nation. For what better defense could there be for democracy than an educated populace? Democracy depends on an educated, informed people; the present education bill, and the amendment which will be offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], will help us achieve

that goal. I urge my fellow Representatives to follow in a tradition over 175 years old and support this commitment to education, to our children, and to our Nation's future.

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, time does not permit a Member of Congress who is not a member of the Education and Labor Committee to adequately present his point of view on this legislation. What used to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, has now turned into an arena where collectivized conformity is required on the part of our colleagues. On an issue of this magnitude and great importance, every Member desiring to express himself should be given the openminded and undivided attention of the entire Committee. However, it is quite obvious to me that openmindedness would be highly desirable but totally impossible with the existing mood so prevalent today.

Therefore, I will not take the time to develop my point of view but simply ask that I be permitted to restate my position on education by inserting a copy of a speech I made in Santa Rosa something over a year ago. I submit it for the benefit of some of my colleagues who will be reviewing the debate as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is intended to remind the Members that constructive alternatives for financing our educational systems are available providing, of course the atmosphere of openmindedness on the part of political leaders prevails. This is but one of many alternatives and I will predict other concepts and alternatives will develop in the coming years.

I believe the gentleman from New York has presented his case in an articulate manner. He is deserving of the commendation of this House but I am convinced his remarks will fall on deaf ears.

Heretofore, I have supported the impacted areas legislation because the Federal Government has a clear responsibility to provide payment to affected school districts but in this bill you added an extension of Federal aid that in my judgment, touches on the question of constitutionality. Further, the intervention of the Federal Government into our educational system has never been projected so boldly.

The fact that State educational systems can be completely bypassed is a very dangerous precedent and title V specifically demands conformity to Federal requirements. This is the door opener to Federal control.

Again for this reason I insert my remarks so the RECORD will include my position on education. Many of us are for similar objectives but the methods for achieving these goals differ substantially. I'm convinced history will record my approach as being proper.

While I find myself in disagreement with this approach, I will not let up in my efforts to convince others to look toward the tax revision and reform concept to assist in financing our educational needs. This will eliminate any possible control of our educational system.

The above-mentioned speech follows:

Today, I have a few comments to make regarding taxes. Some people feel that the tax cut will make people feel happy through this election and a few more to come. To me, this was not the purpose of the bill.

The purpose of the tax cut was primarily to spur the Nation's economy. I tend to believe that this was somewhat overplayed and that only part of the expected economic surge will be realized.

To me, the real reason for this tax cut was to return this $11½ billion to the private sector, to provide capital for growth and expansion, to increase job opportunities of a more permanent nature. Further, it was mandatory that we revise our tax rate structure to permit more equitable competition with other economic unions forming throughout the world.

For every dollar California taxpayers pay to the Federal Government, they get back 79 cents in services, according to the Congressional Quarterly. It is obvious to anyone that those dollars will buy a lot more in services if they are left here in the first place.

If any State in the Union can afford to pay its own way, it is California.

So, my first announcement to you tonight is this: This is not the last of the big Federal tax cuts. If I and a growing number of responsible Congressmen have anything to say about it. this is just the beginning of a major tax reform—hopefully at all levels of government. The major aim of this tax reform is to return Federal tax sources to State and local governments so they can handle their own problems—all directed toward reducing the unbearable load of our real property taxpayers. And to provide a broader tax base to support our schools—our cities, counties, and other units of local government where the demand for service actually occurs.

My own theme is "Home Rule."

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental agreements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate; and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake."

My motto is "Strong local government is the foundation of our Republic." No one can dispute the fact that our educational system, based on home rule, or call it local control if you will, is the greatest in the world. And no one can dispute that our educational system, along with our American system of individual initiative and responsibility, has given our people the highest standard of living in the world.

Yet, our educational system is primarily supported by one of the most limited tax bases available to government—the property tax. Those who earn money pay the bulk of their income, corporate, and excise taxes to the Federal Government. These same people pay the bulk of their sales and use taxes to the State. But the property owners, and this includes many people on retirement incomes, who have already paid for their chilren's education, pay most of the support for our schools. The objective we must all work for is to equalize the tax burden by providing a tax program that properly considers the mobile population problem.

Some will say that the answer is to go to the Federal Government for help from its vast sources of income. And I say to you that to ask for Federal help is to ask for Federal control. I firmly believe it is constituitonally the morally obligatory to maintain a decentralized system of education in America.

I say this without reservation. Federal control has followed Federal aid in many areas. Frankly, the personnel and agencies of Government would not be doing their job if the contingencies for disbursement were not maintained. I would cite further, the Supreme Court of the United States:

In 1942, a case was argued over whether a farmer could accept Government supports but refuse to abide by the attendant Government acreage controls. Justice Jackson, writing the majority decision against the farmer (*Wickard* v. *Filburn*), said:

"It only appears that, if he could get all that the Government gives and do nothing that the Government asks, he would be better off than this law allows." He further said, in a general vein: "It is hardly lack of due process for Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

This, of course, does not preclude the Federal Government recognizing its responsibilities under the impacted area, National Defense Education Act and the National Science Foundation programs.

It is my firm conviction that the solution to our school problems * * * and many of our other problems * * * is to permit home rule to prevail. We must remove tax sources from the Federal Government and return them to the States. The States, in turn, must overhaul their tax structures or revise revenue allocations to provide a broader tax base at the local government and school board level. These new funds could be used as a new source of revenue or relief to the ad valorem taxpayer.

This will give you the funds to meet your own responsibilities. At the same time I pledge to work for more spending cuts at the Federal level so we can afford to repeal these tax sources. I would, however, remind you that we must take into account a major problem of concern to many of us—the national debt. We must come forth with a positive program to retire this debt. I am currently conducting research toward this end.

Individual and community responsibility is the backbone of this country. If and when this is gone, all is lost. We would become mere automations under a socialist master.

A great taxpayer revolt already is building up in this country. My correspondence, and that of my colleagues, shows this. Property owners, of course, are the most concerned. Those of us who subscribe to the philosophy of doing everything possible to permit the private enterprise system to flourish are most encouraged with our successes this far. (Tax cut and foreign aid—more emphasis in the private sector.)

Our first step is to channel this taxpayers' revolt in the right direction. We must provide proper leadership. We must solicit the cooperation of all representatives of government and organizations such as the Sonoma Taxpayers Association.

So I am proposing to you tonight a resolution. A resolution that I hope will be adopted by every school board, village, city, county, special district, and civic body in this district. I am going to send a copy to every one of these bodies and urge that they endorse it.

Further, I am going to send copies of this resolution to all of my 434 colleagues in the House of Representatives. I will ask that they endorse it and likewise send copies to all the local government bodies in their districts.

Now, I would like to read to you what this resolution says:

"HOME RULE AND TAX REFORM RESOLUTION

"Resolution urging revision of tax structure among the various levels of government

"Whereas all local governments in the United States of America are firmly committed to the advancement of the principles of home rule and local self-determination; and

"Whereas these precious principles of American local government are meaningless unless the counties, cities, school districts, and other special service districts concerned have available tax resources for financing local governmental functions; and

"Whereas with home rule, there invariably comes the necessity of home responsibility and the challenge of home achievement since the fulfillment of home rules does not involve the denial of governmental services to the people nor does it involve their being furnished at substandard levels; and

"Whereas the common property tax is now the universally overloaded mainstay of local government finances with the inevitable result that self-sufficiency of local governments is seriously hampered; and

"Whereas local governments need additional independent sources of revenue in order to enable proper home rule performance of governmental services; and

"Whereas strong local government is the foundation of our Republic: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by ——, That support is hereby expressed for the allocation of specific tax sources to local government; and be it further

"Resolved, That support is hereby expressed for an immediate revision of the tax structure at the State and Federal levels with the single goal of returning tax sources to local units of government, thereby enabling said local governments to be more self-sufficient in their own right."

If you concur, I will solicit your support. This resolution, I feel, will set the stage for action by the Congress and all levels of government. I personally feel that the first major step in this tax reform could be the Federal excise tax.

The Federal excise tax on [redacted] service, cosmetics, jewelry, furs, leather goods, amusements, etc., was levied during the Korean war. It was promised that it would expire 2 years later.

But for more than a decade, this tax has been extended year after year. The administration and the Congress has broken faith with the people time after time. In reality, this tax should have been the first to go. It provides Federal income of some $13 billion a year, not a great deal more, relatively speaking, than the recent income tax cut.

To illustrate that possible repeal of the excise tax is not just a dream, I have talked to the chairman and members of the House Ways and Means Committee about it. This is the committee that handles tax bills. I fully believe we can look forward to action to implement these objectives.

It is my plan to continue working with the First Congressional District's schools, cities, counties, as well as the League of California Cities, the County Supervisors Association, the National Association of County Officials in Washington, and any volunteer organization dedicated to the cause of fiscal integrity to advance this tax reform concept.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2362 and urge the defeat of this proposal. The proponents of this measure have utilized the well-tested "poverty" label as a guise to secure passage of this legislation.

The expressed purpose of this bill is to meet the needs of educationally and economically deprived children, but instead it establishes a far-reaching Federal aid to education program which, of necessity, will provide more and more Federal control of our educational systems in this country.

Under this legislation, decisionmaking with respect to course content, curricula, instructional materials and professional standards for teachers would be centralized in the U.S. Office of Education. The language of the bill states that every local project under title I must conform with the criteria established by the U.S. Commissioner of Education in Washington. Federal control inevitably follows Federal grants as surely as night follows day.

Under title II, the Commissioner must approve a State plan which specifies the criteria used by the State in book selection. Under title III we have Federal-local schools teaching youth, training teachers, and responsible only to the Commissioner. Under title IV, the Commissioner will select research areas and be involved with curricula, texts, and course content fed into schools from the laboratories and through the Federal-local schools. And under title V, the Commissioner will be authorized to assign employees from his office to the State departments of education and vice versa.

This legislation provides the framework upon which a massive Federal education agency will be built in the future. Succeeding bills will undoubtedly furnish the bricks and mortar to complete the structure.

Several years ago, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare published a pamphlet entitled, "A Federal Education Agency for the Future," and here are a few statements from that publication.

The Office of Education "may expect to administer operating programs of significantly increased scope and impact." The pamphlet goes on to say that programs may be anticipated in such areas as the "broadening of Federal interest in curriculum and improvement of instruction." Elsewhere in the booklet, we read:

In addition to the Federal level of public policy determination, the Office has much concern with policy matters at the State and local levels, and in higher education institutions.

What was forecast in that publication in 1961 is being authorized here today.

A cursory study of the table in the minority views showing the funds which would be allocated under title I to the 10 wealthiest counties in the Nation and 10 poor counties indicates that whoever devised the formula was not advised that the alleged purpose of the bill was to aid the needy. The end result of this legislation is to give far more money to the wealthiest counties with very small percentages of children in the poverty category and less money to the poorest counties in the Nation with much higher percentages of children from poor families.

Furthermore, the bill presupposes that inferior education is provided for children of low-income families in many of the counties throughout the Nation and that the standard of education is lower for the children of low-income families than that of high-income groups in some of the school districts. This is not the case in my own county, Hamilton County, Ohio. The same standards of education are provided for the children in neighborhoods where income is low as that provided in neighborhoods where income is high. In fact, the students at any one of our elementary and secondary schools often represent a cross-section of income levels.

Another aspect of the bill I would like to mention is the question of aid to nonpublic schools. I believe those who favor such aid will find the benefits available under the bill disappointingly small. It is also well to note that the committee amended title II so that library resources and textbooks are made available to nonpublic schools on a loan basis only. Public authority must retain title and administrative control over such materials, and they must be approved for use by public school authority.

In general, I favor the approach of tax credits as the soundest and fairest assistance in financing the costs of education. This type of assistance is free from Federal control, both substantive and procedural, over educational policies. Moreover, there would be no need to expand the Federal bureaucracy to administer such a program. Second, this approach eliminates the church-state controversy. And, third, it eases the heavy tax burden of our citizens. We have already been advised that more Federal aid for education will be requested next year, and these same tax-burdened citizens will have to pay for it.

There is nothing in the Federal fiscal picture to warrant the claim of Federal aid proponents that the Federal budget can better bear the burden of additional school financing than can State and local budgets. The Federal Government can obtain money to subsidize education only by taking it away from taxpayers in the States. The people would be much better off to keep their money at home, for programs which taxpayers themselves approve. Tax credits are by far a better means to enable individuals to meet the cost of education, whether it be in public or private institutions.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 2362. From the colloquies that have occurred here and the testimony before the committee the need is very clear.

The bill, in my judgment, is correctly directed at one of our most serious problems of 5 million educationally deprived children of the United States, at the correlation between educational underachievement and poverty. It is directed

toward a serious lack of library facilities and textbooks, it is directed at the need for more and better research, it is directed toward strengthening, as appropriate and constitutional, State agencies which in my judgment should be strengthened.

It would be my hope that this bill and the principles included in it, wherein they are constitutional, will have broad, bipartisan support.

I believe that the bill does comprehend some reasonable and relatively clear language with regard to local control over education; particularly in title I.

With regard to the formula, no doubt it could be improved, but I have not heard a better one. I might say that no child in these United States should be abandoned because of the accident of his residence. No county, so far as we know, is completely free of poverty.

Further, I believe that the committee has added some sections that are consistent with the separation of church and state, which is a clear and fundamental principle.

Therefore I hope the House will support this bill, which will do much to help deprived children in poor-income districts of the United States. America must face this serious problem and important opportunity here and now. This is our future and our children are our future's best hope.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have a question relative to one of the sections of the bill, and I would like to have the matter that appears to be somewhat ambiguous cleared up.

I would like to request the chairman to give me the answers.

Is the term "nonprofit" as defined in title VI, section 601(g) to be interpreted in such a way as to restrict the availability of assistance granted under this legislation in the other titles?

Mr. POWELL. I shall be happy to recognize the chairman of the Committee on Interior, my mentor. May I say in reply to the gentleman's question that: First, title VI definitions do not apply to titles I and IV. Second, the word "nonprofit" does not appear in title II. Third, the use of the term in section 304(a) of title III is inclusive and not restrictive. Fourth, title V involves grants to State departments of education where the definition is irrelevant, therefore inapplicable.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCVICKER].

Mr. MCVICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I believe that the Congress should pass this legislation both because it provides ample and imaginative measures to strengthen elementary and secondary school programs, and because it represents a realistic approach to basic educational needs.

In recent years, the cost of education has been making prodigious and ever-increasing demands on local and State governments which have pushed them to the limits of their financial abilities. To meet these demands for adequate school programs, local school districts must rely on one of the most inequitable and regressive taxes—the real estate tax. This present measure will go far to relieve the extreme pressure on the States, and at the same time it will enable them to provide special educational programs which until now have been too much in the backwash of educational attention.

This bill reemphasizes the conviction of the Congress that the States themselves can best manage the affairs of their own schools, since all facilities and programs financed under titles I, II, and III are entirely owned and operated at State and local levels. There is no Federal control; there is Federal support.

As I have strongly supported the principle and fact of equalization among all the areas within my own State of Colorado to provide States moneys to local school districts on the basis of need, so I believe in the same principle of equalization among all the States of the Union to provide financial support through the States to the local district.

The elementary and secondary bill is commendable for numerous reasons. The largest allocation, under title I, bolsters public school programs in areas where there are concentrations of children from low-income families, yet it duly considers school districts where there are fewer families who would qualify for the arbitrary "poverty" designation, but where schools have nonetheless been hard pressed to find adequate finances.

The authors of this bill have wisely recognized that one of the most sorely inadequate and neglected aspects of elementary and secondary education is that of our school libraries. Surely we cannot hope to provide the high quality of education in this country that we seek when nearly 70 percent of our public elementary schools have no library.

Title III of this bill is particularly commendable because it seeks to remedy some of the neglected educational areas of the past through counseling, remedial instruction, and special educational services for rural people. It also looks to the future in providing for special educational services such as classroom television, shared services between schools, and specialized instruction and equipment.

Finally, the provisions which will finance the expansion of educational research and further the training of educational personnel will go a long way toward keeping the competence of teachers abreast of the improvement of school facilities.

There is still much left undone, but this bill will make a large and important first step. We seek excellence, in our Nation's schools.

Quality in education does not come just by chance. You must be willing to pay for what you get. This bill points in the right direction America's willingness to equitably pay for what we are dedicated to: equal opportunity for excellence in education for all.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO].

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the administration's elementary and secondary education bill (H.R. 2362). I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on this particular bill from both sides of the aisle. I have read with great interest this bill, the various titles under the bill, the report of committee hearings and the report of the committee. It is with a profound sense of appreciation that I commend the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable CARL D. PERKINS, and his fine subcommittee for bringing before this House and to the attention of the American people one of the outstanding education bills in the history of our Nation. I also want to congratulate the chairman of the committee, the Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of New York, for the great contribution he has made to the hundreds and thousands of children throughout America who are in need now of better education. I should also like to extend my appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ROMAN PUCINSKI, eighth ranking Democrat on the Labor and Education Committee, who gave me freely of his time in order to consult with me on the aims and aspirations of the committee with reference to this education bill.

It is our responsibility, as Representatives of the people of this great Nation, to provide for quality education for all its citizens, whether they are in the North, in the South, in the East, or in the West. This bill provides special assistance in areas where educationally deprived children are concentrated. This bill does not provide assistance to private or parochial schools as some of those who oppose this bill have not only inferred but accused this administration of breaking down the doctrine established in America of separation of church and state. There is not one dime in this bill that is appropriated directly to any private or parochial school. All of the moneys appropriated in this bill are for the purpose of benefiting the educationally deprived children from poor families in America who are in need of special attention in their education. This bill provides for the local boards of education and local administrators to determine the special educational needs and wants of their communities and to develop special projects to equip and enhance the quality of education of the educationally deprived children in their respective communities.

The distinguished general superintendent of schools for the city of Chicago and president of the Great Cities Research Council for School Improvement, Benjamin C. Willis, whom I had the privilege of talking with in the city of Washington, wholeheartedly approves this legislation. I have received many letters and many telegrams from school principals and school administrators who are in favor of this legislation. The Illinois Education Association has had their representatives call on me in my office urging me to support this legislation. Speaking on behalf of the people in my

district, my city, and my State, and as a man who spent 9 years as a teacher in the Chicago public schools, it is with a feeling of deep responsibility that I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation. This legislation can be truly named "the emancipation of American education," because it provides the teachers and the tools to educate every child regardless of race, color, or creed.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I have studied this bill and the report on it, as well as the hearings. I intend to support the bill. I think the need for it has been amply and clearly demonstrated.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, it is a proud privilege for a freshman Congressman to raise his voice and to cast his vote for this great bill embodying a noble purpose—to begin now the task of helping our public schools.

The public school system has been one of the great creative triumphs of American democratic society. Over the last century our public school system helped make our pluralistic society work—it stretched out a helping hand to children of farmers, miners, factory workers, children of native born Americans and immigrants alike—children of all faiths and colors.

In simpler bygone days the little red schoolhouse and McGuffey's reader could perform this miracle. But today we face a far different, a far more complicated challenge. Today we live in a complex, and automated urban society. For the first time in our history, a strong back and willing heart are not enough to permit most men and women to play useful and rewarding roles in our society. They must also be equipped with learned skills and developed talents to play productive roles in our new urban economy.

There is not a Member of this honorable body who does not have personal knowledge that our public school system today is not doing the job for those children in our Nation who come from underprivileged and deprived homes.

Let us begin now to do that job.

There is no Doctor Pangloss in this Chamber who would tell us that this is a perfect bill conceived in the best of all possible worlds—designed to meet all problems, and to create none. It is a bill wrought on the forge of this pluralistic body, and fired by the commitment of many Members to make the necessary minimum concessions and compromise to achieve a basic philosophy and structure acceptable to as many as possible.

Of course, the bill presents many questions and problems. None of us who have participated in molding and forming this bill believe it presents final answers. We are convinced of only one thing—that it provides now a courageous, ingenious and imaginative beginning.

Let us begin.

The members of the committee have considered carefully the very constitutionality of the bill which we have heard debated in this Chamber. We have provided what we all felt was a meaningful set of safeguards to insure the proper operation and administration of the bill's many new programs.

We feel that the bill is constitutional on its face. We are also well aware that many thoughtful people share a common concern over the possibility that the bill may be administered in an unconstitutional fashion in some local programs.

The programs envisioned under title I are, of course, experimental in nature. The infinite variety of the innovations possible under the bill makes it difficult for any Member to foresee all of these possibilities and to seek to guard against the variety of ways in which local programs might theoretically be conducted in an unconstitutional manner.

We believe we can reasonably assume that local public officials will carry out their public duties, specifically, to administer the shared-time and other programs contemplated in title I, in conformity with the clear intent of the Congress, with the administrative regulations promulgated by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, with State and local laws, and with the U.S. Constitution.

We have created a national advisory council with public members of distinction to be appointed by the President, and with adequate professional staff to be provided by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assure that this is the case, and that the full educational potential of the program is achieved.

We thoroughly expect that the council will scrutinize the operation of the programs under title I in communities across the country to make sure, among other things, that local community programs are carried on in such a fashion so as not to violate the intent of the Congress, and to maintain the proper relationship between the State and the nonpublic schools. If the council members were to find evidence of any abuse, they would be in a position to recommend additional administrative safeguards, and if necessary, remedial legislation, to halt any such practices and to insure that they will not be repeated in other communities in the future.

We likewise expect that the council, in conducting a continuing scrutiny of the various programs will make sure that their full educational and enriching potential is achieved in day to day operations in the local communities.

In the course of the hearings of the subcommittee, virtually all of the educators who appeared before us agreed on the desirability of the mixing and shoulder-rubbing in the classrooms between the nonpublic school children and the public school children which would result from the shared-time programs, and other programs contemplated under title I, as well as in the operations of the supplementary educational centers, provided for in title III. We expect the council and its staff, in its on-going scrutiny of these programs, to make sure that the added educational enrichment produced by this classroom interaction is in fact achieved in the conduct of these local programs.

The experimental program contemplated in title III of the act providing grants to local education agencies for supplementary educational centers and services promises to produce rich dividends in producing new approaches and new techniques to stimulate and nourish the youthful minds which so desperately need help.

This program, like the massive injection of aid in local public schools envisaged under title I, will depend upon local public educational leadership for its driving force; will depend upon local experience, local professionalism, and local insight into the nature and quality of the problems faced by the disadvantaged children in each community. It is the organizing philosophy of this legislation to place local professional school administrators and local elected school board members together in the driver's seat.

The bill provides that the new supplementary educational centers shall not only serve to educate the child, but to elevate the surrounding community as well. The bill assures that the new educational centers will have adequate space and facilities for artistic and cultural programs not only for the benefit of the schoolchildren during the daytime, but also for the neighboring community use during the weekend and evening hours.

The new educational centers will be designed for multipurpose use so that classrooms, auditoriums, and the variety of special audiovisual facilities will be adaptable for use in cultural programs in the arts and humanities which will be planned both for the children during the daytime and for meeting the needs of the adult community for evening and weekend programs. These programs will include: Performance of drama, concerts, and dance recitals; demonstrations by professional theatrical organizations and amateur theatrical groups; and courses, lectures, and seminars employing all audio and visual techniques on the performing arts and humanities.

The President has sent to the Congress an eloquent message recommending passage of legislation which will at long last recognize and encourage the vital role of the arts and humanities in our national life.

A subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee, chaired by our brilliant colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FRANK THOMPSON, is now considering the President's program for a National Foundation for the Arts and a National Foundation for the Humanities which would encourage development of talent, as well as a wide variety of projects and programs in the arts and humanities. The fund to be made available will be used primarily for development of talent and programs and not for bricks, stone and mortar to house these activities.

Thus, it is hoped that the projected new educational centers will help bring the President's program to local communities and provide the neighborhood with a focal point for exciting and stimulating programs in the arts and humanities.

Mr. Chairman, in the past decade and a half, the American people have reached out to the poor, the sick, the ignorant, and the oppressed around the world in an outpouring of compassion and generosity unmatched in the annals of human history; Americans have poured out their substance—well over $100 billion—as well as the time, strength, and talents of our finest and most dedicated professional men and women, to help those less fortunate on this globe who look to us with hands and hearts outstretched.

Is it too much to ask that we begin now the task of setting our own society right; that we set our sights now to devoting less than 1 percent of the resources we have sent overseas, to assist our youth at home who are now condemned to lives of uselessness and despair on the marginal outer fringes of society?

If we really believe that the future of our Nation lies in our youth; if we really believe in the dream of an egalitarian society; if we really cherish the Judeo-Christian ethic and the Sermon on the Mount, we will face the moral imperative: we will begin now.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and to proclaim my support of this worthwhile bill, which I think is long overdue and much needed.

The historic moment for which the friends of education have waited for many years is now upon us. I urge the House to enact the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I acknowledge, of course, that it is not perfect. Bills seldom are. But we must now take that first, historic step, and then continue our efforts. We must not become more absorbed with preserving an issue than with reaching a solution.

We have made great progress in our support of education in this country. The Eighty-eighth Congress was rightfully heralded as "The Education Congress," and it passed several laws strengthening American education. It voted Federal aid to higher education and to vocational education, and enacted a library services bill. In addition, the 88th Congress expanded the student loan and manpower development and training program and substantially enlarged the National Defense Education Act. These actions marked a beginning. Let us now continue.

The previous school legislation has not solved our national problems. There is still a critical shortage of well-trained teachers, and an alarming lack of adequate classrooms throughout the Nation. Together they are severely restricting the quality of American education. May I repeat what President Johnson said in his November 1 policy paper on education:

> We will need a minimum of nearly 400,000 new classrooms in our public schools during the next 5 years to eliminate overcrowding and replace unsatisfactory facilities! We will need over 800,000 new public schoolteachers in the next 5 years to keep up with expanding enrollments and to replace those teachers who retire or resign—and we need to increase incentives so that our best people will be attracted to the teaching profession.

Because of the immediate as well as projected classroom and teacher shortages, we must take action at once. The formula for distributing funds proposed in H.R. 2362 is not the formula that many of the friends of education in this Chamber prefer, but it is a satisfactory formula, and we must not jeopardize the whole bill because it fails to provide all we would like. It will improve existing aid programs. For instance, it broadens the concept of Federal impact. I have long felt that the definition of "Federal impact" and eligibility under Public Laws 81–815 and 81–874 has been too narrowly interpreted. This narrow interpretation has, in effect, contributed to educational inequities among States and school districts. I see in title I of H.R. 2362 corrective legislation to help eliminate such inequities. The more realistic concept of "Federal impact" inherent in H.R. 2362 would enable Public Law 874—only—to function in a broader national interest.

Title I, in effect, proposes that the concept of "national impact" be broadened to include the problems caused by the presence of large numbers of children from low income families—those with $2,000 or less per year. I wholeheartedly support this expansion to provide for channeling Federal funds to disadvantaged school districts, with the administration of such funds remaining with State and local education agencies. H.R. 2362 is not really a general aid to education bill to provide an equalization formula for financing public schools, but it will have some of the same effects, without some of the features that are so vigorously opposed by various groups in our society.

But I repeat: H.R. 2362 is a step forward, and the progress which it makes possible will be marked by cooperation between the State education systems and the National Government. The bill recognizes the economic facts of life regarding education: real property is taxed by the States to the point where the tax threatens business survival, especially in agriculture. Sales and use taxes are regressive by nature and have reached a height that is nearly unendurable. Income taxes are increasingly the domain of the Federal Government. Equalization over State lines through Federal help seems the only solution.

Not that the States should reduce their efforts in behalf of education. I believe that the States should lead in educational support, not follow.

I come from a State whose educational problems have been exposed to the national spotlight. I am pleased to note that a dynamic new State administration under the leadership of a brave and knowledgeable new Governor passed in the recent session of the State legislature a program that has removed the shadow of adverse publicity from our national image. I am proud that Utah did not wait for a Federal program before doing something—a policy pursued by some previous administrations in my State. The actions of the recent legislature will help to restore Utah to its position of leadership in educational effort.

I am proud that Utah has good schools, and a reputation for quality education, paid for at great sacrifice by our citizens. We rank first among the States in percentage of our personal income spent for education, but 37th in personal income per schoolchild. We spend 47 percent of our total State budget for education, and only five States spend more dollars per capita.

These expenditures have paid great dividends. Utah students complete more years of school than students from any other State, and fewer of our young men are rejected by the Selective Service for failing the preinduction mental tests than those from any other State.

In short, we have large families and our children stay in school longer. We spend a large part of our income, both personal and public for education, but we want to do better. We are still not able to provide the quality education that we wish to, and it is increasingly difficult for us to keep pace with the expenditures of larger and more affluent States.

The citizens of Utah owe a great debt of gratitude to their heroic and self-sacrificing teachers who have resisted the temptation to desert their posts of duty for higher salaries and better facilities in more prosperous States. But the sacrifice and diligence of educators in a State are not enough.

I remind you that the investigative report of Utah schools in 1964, conducted by the Utah Education Association and the National Education Association found as follows:

1. There were inadequate and dangerous school facilities which need to be replaced and improved.
2. There were overcrowded classrooms and conditions of work discouraging to students and to teachers.
3. The curriculum offered was narrow, and special programs and facilities normally available were lacking in most areas of Utah.
4. The salary schedules generally in force in Utah were inadequate to attract and hold competent teachers and school administrators.
5. Programs, personnel, and facilities for continuing education for school dropouts and for adults were generally lacking.

These deficiencies were not solved by the recent legislature. They could not be solved with the resources available. In my judgment, the provisions of H.R. 2362—with a first year authorization for Utah of more than $4 million—will do much to help strengthen education in my State. It will help elevate the standards of teachers to the levels the importance of their job demands; it will help pay teachers the salaries which the required skills warrant; it will help cut the student-to-teacher ratio to the point which good sense requires; it will help build the classrooms which are needed; and it will help give every child in the country the educational opportunity—from kindergarten through college—which too few have today.

Let me discuss some of the other provisions of this bill which will have significant importance for Utah.

Title II provides for a 5-year program to make available, for use of all schoolchildren, school library resources and printed and published instructional materials including textbooks. I am particularly pleased at this aspect of the bill. I recall my parental frustration when my own children attending school in both Utah and Maryland—in schools of above-average facilities and reputations—were handicapped because of insufficient textbooks. If this problem needs Federal attention for a solution, then I am for Federal attention.

As President Johnson stated in his special message on education:

TOWARD FULL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation. This is a national problem. Federal action is needed to assist the States and localities in bringing the full benefits of education to children of low-income families.

The provision that materials purchased with Federal funds cannot be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship, and the requirement that materials made available for the use of students in nonpublic schools can be the same as those used or approved for use in the public schools of the State, represent in my view sound assurances that constitutional barriers between church and state will not be transgressed.

Title III, which provides for supplementary educational centers and services, represents a bold and imaginative stride toward the goal of improving elementary and secondary level education in certain poverty areas. I agree that the supplementary education centers must be available to public and nonpublic school students alike. I enthusiastically applaud the fundamental theory of the legislation of concentrating the new Federal aid on the students from the poor family, who need it most, and making benefits broadly available to all such students, regardless of their attendance at public or private schools.

The supplementary education centers, in my view, hold great promise for improving education, especially in the large cities of our Nation, such as Salt Lake City, located in my district. Such supplementary centers could, for example, furnish special courses in science, foreign languages, and the arts. They could provide special classes for economically and culturally deprived children and special instruction for gifted students. Title III takes cognizance of the fact that dollars per capita are not enough. It is very likely true that education for the culturally deprived will cost more per student than education for the average student. Such a discrepancy should not prevent the deprived child from receiving a good education.

Title III, as well as title II preceding it, unfortunately may arouse controversies as to the propriety of providing services to nonpublic school pupils in addition to aiding the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools. However, I feel that such assistance as provided under both titles II and III is justified in terms of individual benefit to students, and does not constitute direct aid to nonpublic schools. Titles II and III are directed toward the improvement of the educational opportunity of all children who are receiving substandard education because of their low economic status. Obviously, the aid is to the individual.

I believe that the provision of both titles II and III will be sufficiently under public control, and contain sufficient safeguards and restraints to assure a strengthening of the quality of American education. And, in my judgment, the Constitution of the United States of America, as well as every consideration of sound public policy, requires that none of the provisions of either title II or III should be construed as providing Federal assistance to support any sort of religious observance, indoctrination, or education.

With regard to the provisions of title IV—Amendments to the Cooperative Research Act of 1954—it should be pointed out that the 1954 act authorized the Office of Education to have jurisdiction over a program which would permit the Commissioner of Education to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities, colleges, and State education agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education.

The program which has subsequently emerged from this decade of experience has facilitated significant progress in educational research, particularly in such areas as curriculum improvement and improved teaching techniques. I am particularly pleased that, under the amendments proposed by title IV, authority would be granted to utilize the research competence of research organizations not now eligible to contribute to the program, such as private noncollegiate research organizations and professional associations.

I view the Cooperative Research Act as among the most outstanding Federal aid to education programs in existence, and I support without reservation the amendments offered under title IV of H.R. 2362. We are living in a new world—a world which is in a process of change with no indication that the rate of change will decelerate. On the contrary, all of the evidence points to the need for us to learn to live with continuous change. This emphasizes the need for an ongoing program of research into new methods and procedures which will enable us to improve our ability to educate more people, both better and more quickly. Money spent for research is an investment in people which can return great dividends to the individual and society.

There was a time when significant educational research was being conducted in my State, but money for research in education was the first casualty in the economy drives of the State administrations of the late 1940's and the 1950's. The losses in educational competence and professional progress because of reduced research activities are incalculable. Some educational activities might be costing us less today had we invested in research yesterday.

Finally, with regard to title V—strengthening State departments of education—I have, during my 5 years in Congress, maintained that American education must be kept both strong and decentralized. The Federal grant program offered under title V of H.R. 2362 would provide a minimal but significant breakthrough in aiding State education agencies in expanding their staffs and strengthening their services to the local school districts. Therefore, this proposal has my wholehearted support.

A second feature of title V which would permit an interchange of personnel between States and the U.S. Office of Education for cooperative educational activities and technical and other assistance, which would help in the strengthening of American education, also has my backing. It provides the first serious attempt to bolster the legal and administrative foundations of our State educational systems.

However, I support this bill for reasons other than the benefits it would bring to my State.

The education of our youth is a national concern and requires national attempts at solution. In fact, education has really become an international problem, with the quality of schools and teachers and texts being very important factors in the development of national policy in international affairs. Hopefully, books and ideas, instead of bullets and bombs, have become the major weapons of warfare in the second half of the 20th century.

It is, then, in the national interest for the National Government to assume a greater responsibility in education.

The people of Utah, the people of the entire Nation, want and deserve the best public schools and the best public education that can be provided for our youth.

I sincerely hope that the bold and imaginative provisions contained in H.R. 2362 will evoke on the part of the 89th Congress a willingness to move forward and make the education of our youth, as President Johnson has said, "the No. 1 business of the American people."

Five years ago when I was a Member of the 86th Congress, I was privileged to speak in favor of the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960. I concluded with a pertinent paragraph from the writings of the great philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead. Those remarks still seem singularly significant today:

In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgement which will then be pronounced on the uneducated.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in all the debate thus far on this bill, and in all of the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, almost nothing has been said about the extraordinary progress we have made in this Nation in providing education. The mistaken impression is left that our educational system is in dire condition.

If this impression is left from our debate, then all perspective has been lost. It is important that we keep our perspective and do not overstate any problems in education. Our teachers, school administrators and school boards have in fact done a magnificent job of providing ever-higher standards of education and ever-increasing opportunities for education.

Many of the children from impoverished families do attend some of the finest schools in the entire world, and have the advantage of all of the programs we have discussed here. Moreover, all children in this country, whether they are from wealthy families or economically deprived families, have the advantage of free, public education.

And we must not neglect the fact that our private and parochial schools are striving constantly to broaden educational opportunities for all children.

Mr. Chairman, it must be said—and we must not leave this record with a contrary impression—that the progress of American education in the past 10 and 20 years is a near miracle, and is an everlasting monument to the dedication of professional educators and to the intelligence of the American people.

Let us look at that record. In 1944 we spent $2 billion for public elementary and secondary education, which was 1.44 percent of our national income; in 1964 we spent $21.3 billion for our public schools, which was 4.45 percent of our national income. For all levels of education, higher and lower, public and private, we spent $3.5 billion in 1944, or 2.07 percent of our income; in 1964 this was $33.7 billion and 7.04 percent of national income.

No nation in all the world makes a comparable investment in education. In this last decade we have more than doubled our expenditures for public education; we have more than doubled our expenditures for all education; and we have very nearly doubled the percent of our income invested in education.

These facts are based upon figures supplied by the U.S. Office of Education and by the National Education Association.

Educational expenditures 1944, 1954, 1964

	Public schools (elementary and secondary)		All education (public and private, higher and lower)	
	Amount (billions)	Percent of national income	Amount (billions)	Percent of national income
School year ending in—				
1944	$2.0	1.44	$3.5	2.07
1954	9.1	2.98	13.9	4.57
1964	21.3	4.45	33.7	7.04

In the past decade we experienced a tidal wave of students in the public schools. However, while enrollments increased by 43 percent, revenues increased by 157 percent. Classrooms increased by 53 percent; instructional staff by 55 percent. Teachers' salaries were increased by 65 percent, as compared to 44 percent for all other wage and salary earners. The number of pupils per classroom declined from 30.5 to 27.6; the number of pupils per teacher dropped from 26 to 23.9.

In 1961, President Kennedy estimated that the Nation would need to build 600,000 classrooms over the next 10 years, or 60,000 per year. In the past 5 years we have averaged 70,000 classrooms each year, and there is no sign of a decline in this rate. These are the undisputable facts of our remarkable progress in education. They are facts taken from official sources, such as the U.S. Office of Education, and from the National Education Association publications.

What of the decade ahead? Official estimates are that the tidal wave of pupils in elementary and secondary schools is over. 1964 marked the end of the 12-year educational cycle of the huge crop of postwar children. The rate of enrollment increases will fall from 43 percent in the past decade to 15 percent in the decade ahead.

Our country has made this great progress in the face of this enormous enrollment pressure which will now ease off—our birth rate has been dropping for nearly a decade and in 1964 stood at one of the lowest points in our national history.

Mr. Chairman, the astounding fact is that 95 percent of these great efforts for public education has been made through State and local effort. It has not required massive—or even very significant—assistance from the Federal Government.

Why is not this sort of factual analysis presented by the U.S. Commissioner of Education and by the President, for that matter, when the Congress and the Nation are asked to consider the Federal role in education? I can only say that such is not the case.

Only one witness before our committee presented these facts. He is Dr. Roger A. Freeman, an economist and authority on school finance, who is a senior staff member of the Hoover Institution of Stanford University. Government witnesses painted their usual gloomy picture—which represents far less than even half the truth about our educational system.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to present these facts to the House, not so much for the sake of arguing the merits of H.R. 2362, but to restore some perspective to our deliberations.

The whole truth is that, with all of our educational needs and the ever-present room for improvement, our teachers and parents, the taxpayers and private contributors, have made and are making a magnificent and unparalleled effort to educate the children of America. I resent having our schools and school systems portrayed as educational and intellectual wastelands. This simply is not true.

American educators, school administrators, teachers, and parents deserve our congratulations and gratitude for their efforts. The record of their achievement speaks for itself.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot remember in the time that I have been in the House of Representatives when there has been more confusion and more misapprehension about a piece of legislation than there is on this bill.

Let me say right at the outset, there have been a great deal of statements made about the sorry condition of education in this country. I am not complacent about our education. I think we should do more. Obviously, if we enacted a full-scale Federal program of educational aid, in 10 years we would still be in here saying the things that are wrong with our education—because it is never perfect.

But let us get some things clear on the record about education in this country.

In 1944 we spent $2 billion on elementary and secondary education. That was about 1½ percent of our national income. In 1964 which are the latest figures available, we spent $21.3 billion for our public schools—not 1½ percent but 4½ percent of our national income.

For all levels of education, higher and lower, public and private, we spent $3,500 million in 1944 or about 2 percent of our income. In 1964 we spent $33.7 billion which is 7 percent of our national income. No country in the world makes a comparable investment in education.

Now what is wrong with this bill? What is the role of the Federal Government in education at the elementary and secondary level? We have seen our colleagues on the other side supporting the bill, trying to tell private school people that they are going to get aid under title I in various ways and trying to reassure the public school people that the private school people are not going to get the kind of aid that the public school people are fearful is going to happen. But some of you perhaps heard the colloquy that occurred yesterday on this floor. I hope you will reread the RECORD today to see precisely the confusion that there was about what kind of programs public funds can be used to support in private schools. The RECORD is still unclear. The closest we have come, after all the chaos and the mixup, is that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] took the floor and at page 5758 he cited what aid could go to private schools, what subjects public school teachers could teach, if you will, on private school property. He said and I quote:

> Thus public school boards could make available services of such special personnel as guidance counselors, speech therapists, and remedial reading specialists, who would reach into the public schools for service in the nonpublic school.

And today he added school social workers to this list. Now we are in a peculiar position as a great legislative body, saying in effect it is constitutional to have remedial teachers—public-school teachers of remedial subjects—teaching in private schools, but that it is unconstitutional to have nonremedial public-school teachers to teach in private schools. Now I ask you? Is this a fair constitutional distinction? Do you draw a constitutional line between remedial and nonremedial public-school teachers? They are both education teachers. They even have gone so far as to imply that they are drawing the line between remedial reading teachers and remedial

mathematics teachers or some other kind of remedial teachers. They may well include all remedial teachers.

I believe we should be writing a bill to truly help the private-school pupils as well as the public-school pupils. But I tell the Members that this kind of provision is very questionable. As surely as I am standing here in the well, no competent constitutional authority is going to draw the line constitutionally for public-school teachers going into private schools as to whether they are remedial teachers or nonremedial teachers of educational subjects.

My friends, this is befogged—intentionally, I fear, befogged—because the advocates of this bill do not wish to be specific about what can happen. So long as it is general and vague they can keep the support of all parties, those deeply troubled on one side and those deeply troubled on the other.

What else is wrong with this bill? The allocation formula in title I to distribute $1 billion is supposedly to help the poor children, the educationally and economically deprived children of this country, yet it gives the wealthiest county in New York State, Westchester County, $2.1 million for the same number of poor children that there are in Sunflower, Miss., while Sunflower is to get only $745,000, one-third in the amount of money. The money truly is to go to the richest counties, because it is based on the per pupil expenditure in those counties. Of course the wealthiest counties are spending more per pupil on education. Is it right to try to equalize and help the needy by giving more aid to the richest counties in the country?

I commend the gentlewoman from Oregon for pointing this out, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] and others who have made it clear that the 10 richest counties in this country will receive twice as much money as the 10 poorest counties, with the same number of poor children.

What else is wrong with this bill?

My friends, only 2 years ago we would not have considered bringing a bill of this nature to the floor, with such a degree of Federal intervention in the decisions at the local level with reference to education. This is a Federal control bill, if one ever was written. In title III alone we are authorizing—I am aghast; I cannot believe this Congress is close to enacting a provision such as this—a $100 million program to set up Federal local schools which can bypass completely the States and State educational authorities. When I offered an amendment to at least require the State educational authorities to approve these loans or grants, it was turned down.

When I offered an amendment to require these Federal local schools to conform to State educational policies and State law, it was turned down. Why? It was because they want to go in with the Federal local schools, into the States, regardless of State educational policies, and set up Federal education policies.

Next we come to title II, textbooks purchased by the Federal Government. Do Members recall the great debates we have had over the control of education, and how we would give money for construction, and the question of whether to make a little bit available for teachers' salaries but not operating expenses, not anything where Federal control could be imposed? Now we are to make $100 million available to purchase textbooks for our local and State people, and we are not even going to focus it on the areas where the children are economically deprived. This is for all over the country, for every school district.

Finally, there is title V, perhaps the most dangerous of all. Here we are going to give $25 million to the State education departments to "strengthen them." But there are 20 pages in this title providing Federal controls, Federal powers in the Commissioner. The Commissioner can then say, "you can have this money only if you pursue educational policies which I, the Commissioner for Education, approve."

Mr. Chairman, I hope that our colleagues will turn down this legislation.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], an expatriate from the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, when I was first elected to Congress I was assigned to the House Committee on Education and Labor. Then, as now, I was convinced that the Federal Government has a responsibility to improve the quality of primary and secondary education, and I supported Federal aid to education.

It was discouraging and frustrating to me to see the issue bogged down in acrimony and dispute over the years. But today we have taken the ball to the one-yard line, and I urge my colleagues to join together for a touchdown. We owe this obligation to the youth of America.

I would also like to mention the difficult and sensitive issue of church and state. I have considered the pending bill carefully and I am satisfied that it provides a reasonable compromise that should be supported by all people of good will. I hope that crippling amendments will be avoided and that the bill will be passed in its present form.

I can truthfully say that I shall vote for this bill happily and without any mental reservation.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, before I yield the balance of my time to the last member of our Committee on Education and Labor, I would like to remind the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] openly and publicly that his own witness whom he requested to appear before us, a noted constitutional lawyer, Leo Pfeffer, said the bill was constitutional.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I consider it a privilege to rise for the first time in general debate to support what I feel to be the most significant legislation to come before this 89th Congress—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I feel that President Johnson summed it up beautifully when he said in his education message, "Poverty has many roots, but its taproot is ignorance."

If we are to advance into the era of the Great Society this legislation—legislation aimed at eradicating ignorance—must be passed.

While I would like to talk about the entire bill, others have covered it very well. Therefore, I will restrict my discussion to title IV.

Mr. Chairman, exciting innovations are taking place in education today.

Research has shown that mentally retarded youngsters can learn vocabulary at six times our normal rate by use of newly developed techniques of program instruction.

Research has proven that blind children can acquire information at four times the speed of braille by a new technique called compressed speech.

A new program has been developed which allows teachers to teach algebra to fifth graders which previously was reserved for high school students.

I could cite many examples, all examples of programs in operation with the support of the Cooperative Research Act of 1954. Laudable as these examples are, our efforts are not enough.

Education is the second largest endeavor of the American people—second only to national defense. We are spending $34 billion annually across this Nation for education. But, of this amount only $72 million is used for research, development, and dissemination—one-fifth of 1 percent. Compare this to the expenditure of $8 billion for research and development of our national defenses—almost 10 percent of our total expenditures in this field. Most progressive corporations allocate at least 10 percent to research, development, and dissemination.

The need to develop new methods to keep pace in this modern society is great, but it is imperative that new methods be the result of sound research, not fad, fancy, or fashion. Title IV seeks this result.

Title IV will revise and supplement the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 to provide broader support for educational research, development, and dissemination. Under the act of 1954 four research centers were established. One at the University of Pittsburgh, and others at the University of Oregon, University of Wisconsin, and at Harvard. These four centers cannot adequately provide educational research for 26,000 school districts in this Nation. Under the 1954 act as revised by title IV we will be able to expand to other universities, colleges, and private nonprofit organizations. The title provides grants for research, training, internships, fellowships, and allowances. It authorizes a $100 million appropriation over 5 years to be spent for projects and grants only after the recommendation of a panel of experts who are not employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, we have no more important undertaking than to see that our people are properly educated. Research is a vital ingredient of education. Title IV supplies that vital ingredient.

Mr. Chairman, education is the key to coping with the future. We have been a long time realizing that. The quality of our education will, to a large extent, determine our future greatness or future failure as a nation. With this education bill, we are investing in greatness.

Figures indicate that since 1946 State and local bonded indebtedness has risen about 450 percent while the Federal debt has increased only about 14 percent. These figures clearly demonstrate why Federal help is necessary if our education system is to meet the increasing challenges and responsibilities facing it.

Local control by either the State department of public instruction or the local school districts is the very foundation of the administrative procedures contained in the bill. Local school districts would plan and execute the program to fill the needs of their communities. In some instances, the State superintendent's office would review the plans. The Federal Government is simply stepping in to provide the money that local school districts badly need. Under this bill, educational programs will be developed by the local agencies that best know their own situation.

Estimates indicate nearly $1,400,000 would be made available to school districts in my district under title I and another $3,350,000 would go to my State of Washington, under the other titles of the bill. This is badly needed by Washington and desperately needed by many other States. I know of no State that claims to be able to do all that is necessary to provide the quality of education this Nation must achieve.

The bill contains five titles, or sections, each designed to attack a different problem.

Title I adds a 3-year program to Public Law 874, the aid to impacted areas law. It is designed to encourage the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs for the educationally deprived children of low-income families. Schools would be eligible for aid for programs designed by the public school officials to meet this need at the local level.

These special programs could include remedial education, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and a number of other things that the local school district would determine could best meet their needs.

The State department of education would be responsible for distributing allotments within the State based on its approval of plans submitted by local school districts. However, upon approval, the county schools would receive the total amount for which they were eligible.

The importance of this section of the bill is clearly demonstrated by facts brought out forcefully during hearings. For example, evidence shows that an educationally disadvantaged child finds himself a year behind in mastering school work by the time he reaches the third grade. He is 3 years behind when, and if, he reaches the eighth grade. These disadvantaged children are primarily from extremely low-income families in which the parents have little education.

One-half of the youth rejected by the Selective Service because of inadequate education had fathers who had not completed the eighth grade. One-half were from families whose head was either unemployed or employed at a very low income unskilled job.

This shows that poverty breeds ignorance and ignorance, in turn, breeds poverty. Title I would attempt to halt this vicious circle.

Title II of the bill provides for school library resources and instructional materials. The current public school levels of 6.2 library books per pupil and $2.28 annual expenditure for books per pupil are well below the recommended professional standards of 10 books and $4 to $6 annual expenditure per pupil.

Title II would provide a first year authorization of approximately $100 million for a 5-year program to make available for use of schoolchildren library resources, including textbooks. A State plan would provide the method of making these available to all schoolchildren. Materials purchased with Federal funds would not be used for sectarian instruction. The books would be chosen by local school boards, within the framework of State laws and would remain the property of the public agency.

While the problems existing in school districts impacted by poverty are particularly acute, there are also chronic limitations in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation regardless of the level of community wealth. Among the variety of supplementary services that make the difference between a poor school and a good school are special instruction in science, languages, music and the arts; counseling and guidance; health and social work.

Yet while these needs are recognized, today less than one-quarter of our elementary schools have the services of a guidance counselor one or more days a week, for example.

Title III of the education bill provides a 5-year program to provide vitally needed education services, not adequately available at the present time. Programs that might be included under this section would be remedial instruction, enriched academic programs, and guidance and counseling services.

The first year authorization would include approximately $100 million.

Improvement of teaching requires, in addition to the establishment of needed programs, research and training to seek better ways of getting the most out of our educational system for each child. Title IV would work in that direction.

There is a total annual expenditure of about $34 billion for education in the United States. About $72 million, or only one-fifth of 1 percent is spent on research.

This is not good when you consider that many progressive private industries invest as much as 10 percent of that total expenditure for research and development.

Title IV would amend the Cooperative Research Act of 1954—Public Law 83–531—by authorizing the training research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from education research and development. The goal of this program is a national network of federally supported but State and university operated research centers.

Title V is aimed at strengthening State departments of education. There would be $8,500,000 in the first year's authorization. The major aim would be to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student teaching with cooperative institutions of higher education. It would also help the State departments of education to improve their effectiveness.

This Nation has been dedicated to progress since its inception. But the sources of progress can change with the changes in our society—with changes in our needs.

Today, education is the hub from which the spokes of progress emanate. We must strengthen that hub.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington consumed 3 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the very immensity of the innovations possible under H.R. 2362 makes all the more difficult and impossible the task and responsibility for me—and others, I believe—to decide whether this bill is constitutional or as the distinguished lawyer from New York, Congressman SCHEUER, said:

> The infinite variety of the innovations possible under this bill makes it difficult for Congressmen to foresee all these possibilities and to guard against programs which might be conducted in an unconstitutional manner.

Congressman SCHEUER continued:

> I voted for this bill in committee and I believe it to be constitutional. However, I share with several committee members, as well as with many of the witnesses who have appeared before the committee, a real concern over the possibility that the bill may be administered in an unconstitutional fashion in some local programs.

Therefore, at a minimum, I hope a judicial review section will be added to the bill.

I include in the RECORD at this point communications which have been received in recent days urging that a judicial review section be added to this bill:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 23, 1965.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

It would be improper for anyone in Congress to say that all Protestant forces have endorsed the education bill, since we have not given full consideration to this bill in our commission on research and social action. I would concur with the judgment of the social trends committee of the National Lutheran Council that we must give attention to some of the possible danger points in such legislation, and it would appear that provision for judicial review would be a wise and proper safeguard.

Dr. FREDRIK A. SCHIOTZ,
President, American Lutheran Church,
Minneapolis, Minn.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
March 25, 1965.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As executive secretary of the International Convention of Christian Churches and a member of the general board of the National Council of Christian Churches, I wish to reaffirm my support for an "adequate provision for judicial review" in the education bill (H.R. 2362) which would assure that the programs developed under this bill are "compatible with the religion clause of the first amendment." This language approved by the general board of the National Council of Christian Churches on February 26, 1965, clearly calls for a judicial review which makes possible a test of the validity of programs under the bill as related to the first amendment. I urge that an amendment be added to this bill which would enable local educational agencies to raise the first amendment question.

A. DALE FIERS,
Executive Secretary, International Convention of Christian Churches.

A COMMUNICATION TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE SUBJECT OF A JUDICIAL REVIEW PROVISION IN THE BILL FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION, MARCH 23, 1965

The bill for Federal aid to education introduced by Representative CARL D. PERKINS, with the support of the administration (H.R. 2362), will shortly come before the House for debate and action. Although a number of desirable changes have been made in the bill by the House Committee on Education and Labor, it still contains some provisions that could be administered in a manner violative of the requirements of the clauses on religion in the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Yet there is a substantial possibility that, if the bill is enacted in its present form, it will not be possible for anyone to initiate a proceeding enabling the courts to pass on the constitutional validity of the programs financed under its terms.

It is an acceptable part of our legal system that constitutional guarantees are enforceable by the courts and that actions by governmental agencies are subject to judicial review to insure adherence to constitutional principle. Programs under the Federal aid bill, however, appear to fall within an exception to that general rule since no individual or official would be in a position to initiate a proceeding for such judical review.

As a result, it is entirely possible that Federal funds may be paid out in substantial amounts and over a number of years, without any person having the opportunity to obtain a judicial ruling on the legality of this use of the taxpayers' money. That is a situation plainly at variance with the general assumptions underlying our judicial system.

The undersigned organizations therefore believe that it is essential that H.R. 2362 be amended so as to permit judicial review. Inclusion of such a provision is an eminently sensible precaution. Those who believe that the bill presents no constitutional problems can hardly object to a procedure that would result, if they are right, in judicial vindication of their claims. On the other hand, they can hardly claim that unconstitutional programs should be allowed to continue unchecked.

We [the organizations listed below] therefore urge support of an amendment to H.R. 2362 providing for judicial review. (Such an amendment, of course, could contain appropriate provisions to guard against multiple or protracted litigation.) Only by adopting such an amendment, could Congress guard against expenditure of public funds in violation of the basic law of the land.

American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

American Jewish Committee, 165 East 56th Street, New York City.

American Jewish Congress, 15 East 84th Street, New York City.

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

Central Conference of American Rabbis, 40 West 68th Street, New York City.

Jewish Labor Committee, 25 East 78th Street, New York City.

Jewish War Veterans, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Rabbinical Assembly of America, 3080 Broadway, New York City.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 838 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Unitarian-Universalist Association, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

United Synagogue of America, 3080 Broadway, New York City.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
March 23, 1965.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The National School Boards Association composed of the 17,000 local school boards responsible for educating 95 percent of the Nation's public elementary and secondary school pupils would strongly support a proposal to amend H.R. 2362 to incorporate a provision for judicial review. Important concerns about separation of church and state and local controls of a strong vigorous system of public education mandate this support.

W. L. ROBINSON,
President.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 24, 1965.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: H.R. 2362 (the education bill) as presently written raises many questions for which adequate answers have not yet been given.

The principle for distribution of funds does not seem to take adequate account of certain States and areas with greater needs.

The bill also introduces such concepts as "shared services" which are very unclear. Under "shared services," can a teacher on the public payroll teach in a private school? What is included and what is excluded by stating that such teachers must be "temporary"?

Since the local public agencies which administer the funds must clear with local private school administrators, does this give a kind of veto power to private school administrators? Will this tend to produce serious and unfortunate interfaith disputes at local and State levels?

Because of the unknown implications of several sections of H.R. 2362, we urge that an adequate judicial review section be added to the bill. Such a process of judicial review would enable responsible evaluation of the results of this legislation. We urge that the Congress take sufficient time to consider carefully the need for this and possibly other clarifying amendments.

Sincerely yours,

A. DALE FIERS,
Executive Secretary, International Convention of Christian Churches.

VIRGIL A. SLY,
President of the United Christian Missionary Society.

BARTON HUNTER,
Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Action and Community Service.

GEORGE O. TAYLOR,
Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Education.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
MARCH 25, 1965.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The following telegram was sent to CARL ALBERT. You have recently received a communication from Dr. George Davis, minister of National City Christian Church, stating his personal support for the education bill as it is presently written and implying that resolutions of the International Convention of Christian Churches tend to support his position. We understand that his telegram was read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday. Dr. Davis has every right to this opinion. However, it should be pointed out that the major emphasis of all resolutions of the international convention on this subject emphatically state that public moneys should be used only for public education. A recent partial survey of our membership showed that 85 percent of those who replied agree that "No tax in any amount large or small can be levied to support any religious institutions." Our position which we communicated to you yesterday should not be interpreted as opposition to the basic purpose of the bill. But we are committed to the need for an adequate judicial review section in the education bill as a more accurate reflection of the thinking of our membership.

BARTON HUNTER,
Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Action and Community Service, United Christian Missionary Society.

MARCH 23, 1965.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.:

United Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, exclusively representing all 48,000 teachers and professional staff of New York City Board of Education urges you vote against Federal aid to education bill. The measure would violate church-state separation, grant public tax fund to parochial schools, create divisiveness in America, accelerate flight of students from public schools, increase segregation in public schools, weaken our system of public education. Our 2,000 delegates from over 850 schools have overwhelmingly voted against this bill. We urge its defeat.

ALBERT SHANKER,
President, United Federation of Teachers.

STATEMENT FROM MRS. WALTER N. OLVERSON, EDITOR, EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS, EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 25, 1965

If H.R. 2362 is jammed through in its present form now, we may all have good reason to regret it.

There has been too much rush and too little deliberation on the programs authorized by this legislation. If ever a bill needed full delineation of its consequences, it is this one, because it reaches to the very foundations of our system of public education.

Careful examination is the more important because the bill concerns a subject in which there is no disagreement as to purpose, only disagreement as to method. Everyone endorses the objective of better schools. Our school system has undergone extensive improvement already. Haste and unwise Federal action could reverse the process.

The objective of better schools concerns our children and their readiness for a better tomorrow, and is essential to economic growth and national security. It is not a party matter or a political matter, and it should not be the subject of ready compromises or makeshift arrangements. It extends far deeper, and is far more important, than politics or any short-range interests, whatever their character.

The bill, in its present form, would plunge the Nation headlong into the church-state issue. There is no cautious approach to this issue here. We would go into it totally and blindly.

The church-state issue is before the courts now. If the bill should be enacted as reported from the committee, the church-state issue would be spread over 90 percent of the school districts of the Nation.

The problem would be further complicated by the fact that the bill provides for extensive Federal direction of the course of public and nonpublic elementary and secondary education, reaching into curricula, methods, programing, and goals.

Can we say with any assurance that the present cooperative relationships of public and private schools will not be disrupted by Federal aid which involves such things as equipment, textbooks, and the sharing of facilities and teachers? We certainly should approach with caution an action that could upset relationships that have been developed, in hundreds of communities, over the generations that our educational system has grown.

On top of all this, however, the bill as reported makes no provision for a judicial review of this question of aid to church schools. Do we really believe we could clamp a lid tightly enough on the constitutional kettle to hold back the steam that the bill inevitably would generate? Are we unaware of the reaction potential in this legislation? By all means, the bill should provide for judicial review of this question of aid to church schools so that this issue could be settled at the earliest possible time. Otherwise, the entire American educational system could be damaged.

We are being asked to rush action on this measure before the contents of important documents are made known. Careful examination of the subject of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education would seem to require the release of the Gardner Task Force report on Federal programing in the field of education and the Office of Education study of the justifications for the existing impacted area aid program.

When we are legislating in an area as important as this one is, why should valuable information be withheld? Surely, when we venture into legislation whose final consequences cannot be known, the truth more than ever is our friend. In any case, we cannot escape it, for as Goethe well observed, "Nothing that shuts truth out is safe from truth."

Rather than to legislate hastily and cursorily in a field that involves the education of our children, it would be better not to legislate at all.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 25, 1965.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Aid public schools only, otherwise gradual destruction is evitable as in Holland after government began subsidizing church schools 45 years ago, 80 percent children there now in church schools whereas previously 80 percent in public schools.

Mrs. DOREEN M. TAYLOR,
Executive Director, Americans for Public Schools.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] has performed a remarkable service in presenting the table of the 10 wealthiest counties which would receive a total of $8.9 million from the Federal Government under provisions of the bill now before us. Given proper circulation, that table could be the determining factor in the fate of this legislation, for no responsible individual—regardless of his philosophy on Federal intervention in State and local school affairs—would accede to any such unjust and inequitable use of U.S. Treasury funds.

The editor of the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat was quick to publish his views on the subject when the table was made available to him, and under unanimous consent, I include this analysis in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Certainly a similar response will come from editors and thought leaders throughout the country once they have an opportunity to digest the import of the bill.

Those of us who have been in Washington for any length of time are familiar with Montgomery County, Md., which is promised more than half a million dollars under this bill. The drive out River Road to Potomac is always an exciting experience, though anyone who resides in the average American community cannot help but react with mixed emotions as he passes the luxurious showplaces with multicar garages, riding stables, and Olympian swimming pools. An added convenience is that all homes are handy to a country club, each with a luxurious lounge and dining room with elegant cuisine.

Recognizing that not all of Montgomery County adjoins River Road, the fact remains that the average family income of the entire county is $9,317. I do not know how much the residents have invested in stocks, bonds, and Swiss banks, but you can be certain that the total would go a long way toward reducing the debt of the Federal Government.

Now I am not proposing that Uncle Sam look into this accumulated wealth as a start to getting out of hock. He is already putting a good-sized tax bite on these comfortable citizens, and they will duly file their returns before April 15 whether or not they return from Florida by that time. What I am suggesting is that the people of my constituency and yours should not be expected to put up the wherewithal for Montgomery County to carry on its school program.

I only wish that it were possible for each Member of Congress to compare statistics on personal income in his own counties with the Montgomery County table before this bill were to come to a vote. Certainly there are few among us who would not come to the conclusion that this is a deplorable piece of legislation that should be chucked right back to committee. Can the taxpayers of your constituency afford to assist Montgomery County take care of its school expenses? I remind my colleagues that this same county received nearly $4 million in Federal impact funds for its schools last year. The people in the Pennsylvania counties of Armstrong, Cambria, and Indiana have all we can do to maintain a good school system of our own without being expected to contribute to the more opulent areas of our society.

We will be hearing that the Federal Government will put up the wherewithal for the monstrous spending orgy, but our people back home have still not been mesmerized into believing that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing need only turn up the presses to absorb the cost of the project. They know too well what bureaucratic extravagance has done to their income. You need not go far from the classroom to find casualties of inflation, for there are retired teachers in every community whose pensions and savings are worth only a fraction in buying power of what they were given to believe they would have at the close of their careers.

The Federal Government cannot give back to the people more than it takes from them. Whatever amount of funds flow out of Washington is necessarily only a portion of what has been taken in, for the expenses of a bureaucracy are multifarious. Should this bill become law, another large block of high-paying Government jobs will be created. Salaries for this new set of Government workers will be two times, three times, and four times the income of the teachers in our schools then beholden to Federal authorities.

For beholden they would be, Mr. Speaker, since Federal control follows Federal funds as surely as day follows night. It is a tragic thought, for the assembly-line process of teaching would deprive both our teachers and our students of freedom of thought and of individual imagination and investigation. Whether the Federal Government buys books, grants scholarships, or merely sends a check to be used for educational purposes, ground rules must be set up to make certain that recipients conform to Washington standards.

There are two obvious ways in which Congress can assist State and local school systems in overcoming financial difficulties. Either or both would make more money available for building new schools, for equipping them, for increasing teachers salaries, and for whatever other uses might be decided upon by local authorities. I have introduced a bill to increase tax exemptions for parents of students in order that taxpayers might be able to retain a greater share of their earnings to meet local needs. Another method of helping with the school problems would be to return a percentage of total tax income from each State earmarked for educational purposes. Neither of these methods would require the establishment of a new and costly bureaucracy to dispense funds and services, and neither would open the way to Federal control.

To give our people the most for their money and to assure them of the freedom that our schools have enjoyed through the years, I ask my colleagues to reject this horrendous and unjust legislation now before the House and to turn instead to a reasonable, inexpensive, and unencumbering kind of relief that I have suggested.

The editorial from the March 4 Johnstown Tribune-Democrat follows:

SCHOOL AID BILL'S FORMULA UNSOUND

A comparison of figures in the administration's Federal school aid bill, approved Tuesday by the House Education and Labor Committee, reveals that the distribution plan for the $1.3 billion is a bit out of kilter.

Figures brought to light by Representative WILLIAM AYRES, an Ohio Republican, disclose what could happen in a hypothetical situation.

Let's say the Government has on hand surpluses of all the foodstuffs and is doling them out to all States. If the Government were to distribute the food along the same lines as those called for in the school aid legislation, Texas would get most of the beef and Idaho most of the potatoes.

That's about what will happen should the present allocation plans of the school aid bill be followed.

Representative AYRES has taken the 10 wealthiest counties in the Nation and 10 of the poorest and has shown that the well-off ones will be getting almost twice as much aid as the other 10—despite comparable numbers of pupils from impoverished families, defined in the bill as those with less than $2,000 in annual income.

Illustration: Westchester County in New York has 6,210 children (3 percent of its pupil population) in such families. Sunflower County in Mississippi has 6,184 children (42 percent) so classified.

Payment basis: Multiply the total number of children from impoverished families by one-half of the State's average expenditure per public school pupil.

Result: Westchester would receive $2.1 million, Sunflower $745,000.

Reason: New York spends more per pupil than does Mississippi.

Westchester gets more even though it has more well-off families to absorb the cost of bettering the schools.

The effect of such a formula for payment would seem to encourage States spending less on education to increase their outlays. To put the aid where it is most needed, the process would have to be reversed. However, that might tend to make the higher spending States reduce their expenditures.

In his analysis, Representative AYRES says, "we do know that some schools in large cities and impoverished rural areas are being overwhelmed by large numbers of school-age children whose environment leaves them unprepared to take advantage of educational opportunities. I am most sympathetic toward this matter and at first glance at the proposed bill could but agree that the problem cried for solution."

But Tuesday, Representative AYRES said, "Instead of concentrating on those of the greatest need the bill would pour funds into many districts where the need is either negligible or does not exist at all."

The provision of the bill which qualifies counties for aid on the basis of 100 schoolchildren from families making less than $2,000 a year makes 94 percent of the Nation's 3,000 counties eligible. Counties with a very small percentage of their pupils so classified certainly should be able to handle their own problems. The Federal money should be left for counties whose percentage of impoverished children is in the higher brackets.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my strong support for this bill, especially in this critical time facing our cities.

If anything is going to help solve the problem of our seriously disadvantaged city areas, it is improved primary and secondary public education. It is gratifying, of course, to see an education bill for schools at this level, but it is especially noteworthy that we have a bill that is reasonably responsive to the needs of our urban areas. The cities of this great country have been generous over many decades to the more rural areas. The richer States have, without complaint, made tax money available to the Nation, with relatively small return to themselves. This bill is fair to all, and at the same time it recognizes the special problem of our specially disadvantaged areas.

New York receives the largest allocation of funds under this bill, and under title I New York receives by a fairly substantial amount the largest share. This is as it should be for New York has the biggest problem in some of its pressure areas such as Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant. Title I is designed to meet head on the problem of massive educational shortages in public school districts having high concentrations of children from low-income families. Of course it will not cure all the ills. It may not make even a large inroad. But it will make at least a big dent.

Mr. Chairman, I and the other Members of the Committee on the Judiciary are considering important civil rights bills. Many thought we had solved the legislative problem in 1964. We did not. And we may not solve it in 1965 with another civil rights bill. We will never solve the civil rights problem until we uplift school and housing conditions in these overcrowded, slumridden, disadvantaged areas. Good, strong public schools at early ages is essential to more jobs and less welfare, more leadership and less indolence, more responsibility and less crime, more abundance and less poverty.

I am pleased also, Mr. Chairman, that the bill recognizes the need for strengthening State departments of education. Our country will be stronger and better primary public education offered when State education departments are made stronger.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying to me personally to see included in the bill a form of a concept that I authorized in the last Congress of a National Advisory Council, appointed by the President. Such a council is necessary with title I, for the problem of disadvantaged children in this country, and especially in our cities, is a complex one to which all the answers have by no means been found. This Council will do much to assist the Congress and the executive branch in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Education is the foundation of a democratic form of government. An enlightened citizenry is essential to its growth and prosperity. These are truths accepted by most of our citizens, so education then becomes an investment in the foundation of our country.

Probably the most significant returns from investment in education are certain qualities and insights that are essential for growth in economic as well as other spheres of life. Education contributes to the development of a literate and informed people capable of maintaining free institutions and achieving democratic aims. Education helps in maintaining the degree of political and social stability that is essential for economic and other forms of national growth. Education develops respect for scientific research and for the new knowledge it discovers. Education aids in developing readiness to apply new knowledge to economic and other areas of life. Education plays a major role in developing the specialized technicians and the broadly educated and responsible leaders demanded in all fields in a complex and highly developed society such as that of the United States.

It is imperative that we recognize the many and highly significant returns which accrue from wise investment in education. It is also imperative that we avoid the social penalties that have their origins in neglect of education.

It is a shocking fact that while the United States stands for equality of opportunity, it permits gross inequalities in educational opportunity.

Far too high a percent of our citizens suffer handicaps that result from lack of functional literacy. Fewer and fewer children are denied schooling completely, but many children attend poor schools and only for a short period of time. Lack of adequate schooling, both as to quality and amount, is partly responsible for the millions of disadvantaged Americans who have recently been migrating from undeveloped rural slums to congested urban slums.

Low educational achievement is associated with low earning capacity, unemployment, high rates of rejection for military service, and dependence on various types of relief.

Recent analyses of the relation of education to economic development indicate that the development of "human capital"—specifically, investment in education—has actually been more important as a source of economic growth than has the accumulation of physical capital.

Education contributes directly to economic growth because it improves the quality of the labor force. Education contributes directly, but significantly, because it is the source of the research for much of our technological progress.

It has been estimated that in recent years investment in education has been responsible for up to 40 percent of the

Nation's growth and productivity through higher wages and greater purchasing power for the worker in the new products and techniques which come from trained minds.

Yet, while we want the best kind of school possible, we have not yet demonstrated as a nation that we are willing to pay for the best. We must face up to the need for the very large number of teachers that will be required, as well as for the increasing need for teacher specialization.

We must substantially raise teachers' salaries and help to insure that a higher proportion of our schoolteachers will become career teachers.

Schools of the kind we want will cost more money, a lot more money. The cost of education will continue to rise even if we merely accommodate sheer numbers and do nothing at all to improve the quality of education.

For a long time, there have been wide gaps between fiscal needs and resources not only among the separate States but often among the school districts of some of the wealthier States.

Even though poorer States often make a greater tax effort for education than the wealthier States, the level of their educational support is often far short of what is adequate because of their insufficient tax base.

The need for Federal aid to education—particularly at the elementary and secondary levels—is greater today than ever before. Essentially, the problem is that States and communities have unequal resources with which to meet their educational needs.

Many States and localities have made truly heroic efforts to meet their educational needs, in some cases doubling the percentage of their income committed to the support of education.

Yet for all this effort, inequality of educational opportunity has actually become greater in recent years. In 1957, the five States lowest in educational expenditure, spent an average of $238 less per pupil than did the five States highest in educational expenditure. By the 1962–63 school year, this gap between the five lowest and highest States had widened to $322 per pupil.

We are therefore farther from equal educational opportunity than we were years ago.

Many areas simply lack adequate financial resources and, in other areas, such as the Appalachian coal regions, once great resources are rapidly being depleted.

Moreover, the problems of urban schools are becoming particularly severe as tax resources are steadily moving to the suburbs, leaving the city schools with the expensive job of educating disproportionate numbers of children from low income and minority group families. Educators know how to reach these children, but it is a costly process which few cities and States can undertake alone.

It is obvious that the squeeze on the limited tax sources of States and localities is getting tighter and tighter each year as school costs grow and tax resources shrink—especially in the less affluent parts of the country.

In 1962 local sources contributed 56.7 percent of all public elementary and secondary school revenues. State governments contributed 39 percent of all school revenues. The Federal Government contributed only 4.3 percent of all school revenue. In fiscal 1962 Federal taxes accounted for 66 percent of all tax revenues, but less than 1 cent of each Federal tax dollar went for schools.

It is unmistakably clear that the Federal Government is not presently contributing its fair share in the financing of American education.

Only at the Federal level can taxes be collected where the wealth is, and made available for education where the children are.

Although Congress has been unable to pass a "general Federal support bill"—for school construction and/or operation and maintenance, including teachers' salaries—the Congress has approved many forms of specialized or "categorial" aids.

However, insofar as elementary and secondary schools are concerned, the Federal money has been forthcoming only for various special and limited programs. It is usually given to meet a particular national crisis—such as vocational training in the World War I era, emergency depression aid in the 1930's and in recent years Federal funds under the National Defense Education Act to meet the cold war challenges to American education dramatized by the Soviet Union's Sputnik I. But these and a few other limited programs have made little dent in helping the Nation's schools meet their overall mounting financial problems.

I believe that President Lyndon Johnson, as President John F. Kennedy before him, has put the needs of American education in their proper perspective. Never before in our Nation's history have two Presidents shown the knowledge of, and interest in, the problems confronting American education.

In a ringing reaffirmation of his campaign pledges to improve the whole of American education, President Johnson's education policy paper of last November 1, drew a portrait of a cohesive educational structure and pledged "to get on with the task" of building that structure. Said President Johnson, in part:

> We must act. I pledge now to put education at head of our work agenda. First, we must broaden and improve the quality of our school base. We will need a minimum of nearly 400,000 new classrooms in our public schools during the next 5 years to eliminate overcrowding and replace unsatisfactory facilities.
>
> We will need over 800,000 new public school teachers in the next 5 years to keep up with expanding enrollments and to replace those teachers who retire or resign—and we need to increase incentives so that our best people will be attracted to the teaching profession. But most of all we must provide a good education for every boy and girl—no matter where he lives.

In my view it is imperative that we move forward immediately, and we have the opportunity to do so by enacting H.R. 2362 which this honorable body has presently under debate. Our crucial needs at the elementary and secondary level are intensifying. Our deficiencies are growing more critical every day. We cannot afford to lose another year in making a national effort to lift the quality of elementary and secondary school instruction.

H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, constitutes the first step in accomplishing the objective, so desirable, of a quality education for each of our young people.

Title I of the bill proposes the allocation of aproximately $1 billion to provide an acceptable education for approximately 5 million young people coming from families having less than $2,000 annual income. The remaining titles of the bill propose the first step in raising the quality of education throughout our elementary and secondary schools. It would allocate $255 million to—

School library resources and instructional materials;

Supplementary educational centers and services;

Educational research and training; Cooperative Research Act; and

Strengthening State departments of education.

When the magnitude of the problem is compared to the proposed expenditure, this must be recognized as a very modest approach to the ultimate solution of the problem. I commend the House Committee on Education and Labor for presenting to us a vehicle in this bill to provide adequate educational facilities to our youth and urge the Members of this House to support it in making it a reality.

The education of our people, young and old alike, is a national investment. This investment will yield tangible returns in economic growth, in improved citizenship, and in higher standards of living. Free men and women value education as a personal experience and opportunity.

It is the responsibility of all educators, all citizens, and all levels of government to join in doing whatever is necessary to ensure that our educational institutions—and with them our precious freedoms—grow and flourish.

At this time I would like to commend to your thoughtful consideration a quotation from "The Rockefeller Report on Education—the Pursuit of Excellence—Education and the Future of America":

> All of the problems of the schools lead us back sooner or later to one basic problem—financing. It is a problem with which we cannot afford to cope half-heartedly. Education has always been essential to achievement of our political and moral objectives. It has emerged as a necessary ingredient in our technological advancement. And now events have underscored its value in terms of sheer survival.
>
> It will not be enough to meet the problem grudgingly or with a little more money. The Nation's need for good education is immediate; and good education is expensive. That is a fact which the American people have never been quite prepared to face. At stake is nothing less than our national greatness and our aspirations for the dignity of the individual. If the public is not prepared for this, then responsible educators, business leaders, political leaders, unions, and civic organizations must join in a national campaign to prepare them.
>
> But first our national leaders will themselves have to grasp the true scope of the

task. Perhaps the greatest problem facing American education is the widely held view that all we require are a few more teachers, a few more buildings, a little more money. Such an approach will be disastrous. We are moving into the most demanding era in our history. An education system grudgingly and tardily patched to meet the needs of the moment will be perpetually out of date. We must build for the future in education as daringly and aggressively as we have built other aspects of our national life in the past.

During a recent visit to Washington of Dr. Frederick L. Hipp, executive secretary of the New Jersey Education Association, it was my pleasure to discuss the various aspects of the pending education bill. At that time, I requested of Dr. Hipp certain information as to the impact of this legislation upon the children of New Jersey, plus some statistics regarding the need for Federal funds to alleviate certain conditions in the educational field of the State.

The figures presented to me by Dr. Hipp are very revealing and I would like to take this opportunity to share this information with my colleagues in this House by inserting Dr. Hipp's letter into the RECORD at this point:

NEW JERSEY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Trenton, N.J., March 4, 1965.

Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HELSTOSKI: We are most pleased to know of your favorable attitude toward President Johnson's proposals to provide Federal assistance to elementary and secondary education. As you know, areas of New Jersey are very much in need of such Federal assistance. Eighty-eight percent of our population is classified as urban and this brings with it all of the problems to be found in most large cities in the Nation. With 888 persons per square mile, we have the greatest density of population of any State in the Nation.

Our crime rate increased 50.1 percent from 1958 to 1963. In 1963, New Jersey suffered the 13th highest crime rate of 50 States.

It is obvious that we need to broaden our curricula when we see 11,639 dropouts in one school year. The jobless rate for high school dropouts—which was 12 percent in 1961—rose to 31.7 percent in 1963. We consider this situation to be socially dangerous.

Studies show that 58,079 New Jersey children are suffering part-time education and 46,646 are in substandard classrooms such as basement rooms, churches, fire stations, and the like. Furthermore, 6,526 of our teachers do not meet the minimum standards for certification.

In spite of the great need for giving individual attention to children, 20 percent of our 28,141 regular elementary classrooms have more than 30 pupils. One out of 28 has more than 35 pupils. Only 43 percent had 25 or fewer pupils.

In summary, New Jersey is a highly urbanized State whose school problems are multiplying in the midst of its rapid growth. President Johnson's program for Federal assistance directed at many of these problems can give real hope to thousands of New Jersey's children.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK L. HIPP,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to the entire debate on this legislation and believe that the arguments in support of H.R. 2362 far outweigh those presented in opposition to it. I am in full accord that the need for financial assistance to our schools and libraries is acute and that this legislation should be passed by an overwhelming vote by this honorable body. We shall not regret our support of this measure and we shall take a great step forward in helping the youth of today to obtain a better education to carry on as influential citizens of tomorrow.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, we are nearing the end of general debate on an historic bill, the first general education bill to reach the floor of the House of Representatives.

In a few minutes, we will arrive at the crucial stage of our deliberation, the stage at which we will vote either to gut and mangle this legislation by amendment or send it to a final vote in a form which will offer substantial assistance to the children of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished committee which brought this bill to the floor has accomplished a legislative miracle. It has achieved a delicate balance between conflicting viewpoints, and it has constitutionally skirted the pitfalls which prevented aid in the past for all our children, whether in public or private schools.

I have listened most carefully to the debate today and yesterday and I am forced to the sad conclusion that there are some among us who hope, by adroit amendments, to appeal secretly to our prejudice.

The danger to this historic bill lurks in two areas. On one side we have proven friends of education who are bemused by their own theories and who will accept amendments from those who seek only to emasculate the whole proposed program. They are the unwitting tools of the "divide and conquer" plotters.

On the other side is a group relying on fallacious constitutional arguments to kill this bill as a workable measure by baring it to the judicial stones and arrows of any crackpot bigot in the Nation. They do not openly say here that they are against the bill because its benefits range outside the public schools. That would be politically dangerous. Instead they would have us write into the measure a judicial review provision which would be seized by others to negate and nullify the whole program.

They will seek to lull us also by an amendment changing the formula for educational aid, an amendment that could wreck the measure.

I do not claim that the formula in the bill is perfect. I do not think any State has ever written a perfect formula for the distribution of its educational funds. But I do say that the formula we have is workable. It has been drawn carefully, in cooperation with skilled educators and administrators. If we tinker with it, we will find that we have destroyed the mainspring of the watch.

If any here think that they can vote for amendments which gut the bill and then redeem themselves politically by voting for the bleeding carcass that is left, I warn them that the American people are becoming aware of that form of legislative quackery.

We have a good bill. Let us pass it and, at long last, fulfill our responsibility to the youth of our Nation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I am told that the pending Federal aid to education bill could result in the distribution of about one million dollars to the schools of the 16th Congressional District of Ohio, or about 2 percent of the amount that is now being spend for education in Stark, Wayne, and Tuscarawas Counties.

This money could be used for special programs that would help the "educationally deprived children" of the district, and I suppose it is possible to segregate in some manner the children from low income families who could be classified as "educationally deprived" and spend this amount of money in their behalf next year.

I have been urged to support the bill because educators in my congressional district tell me that they despair of getting sufficient State or local funds to operate the kind of public school system they believe we should have in Stark, Tuscarauas, and Wayne Counties. I am told that Ohio is stingy with school funds and that our per capita expenditures for schools is below that of many States with smaller per capita resources. And so my teachers and principals, at least a number of them, ask me to vote for this Federal aid bill.

I think we should examine Ohio's situation carefully before we permit our frustration and discontent to lead us into support of this Federal aid measure. We should consider what this may cost Ohio.

Ohio's share of the Federal tax burden for the $1,060 million to be spent under title I would be $58,600,000, or almost $22 million more than we would receive for our schools under this title. If Ohio schools are desperately in need of another $36,700,000 to spend for educationally deprived children or any other educational purpose next year, it seems to me much wiser to raise that amount in Ohio rather than to send $58,600,000 to Washington in order to get back $36,700,000.

We can relate these figures to the 16th Congressional District, as well. We would get about $1 million. But based upon the per capita tax burden in the 16th Congressional District, our people would have to contribute $2,390,000 to get that $1 million. Again, it seems to me that we could better afford to find some means of raising that million dollars in the 16th Congressional District, instead of sending nearly $2.50 to Washington for every $1 we receive back.

These figures illustrate the financial nonsense of this particular Federal aid program, but let us go farther into the subject and consider the probable effect of the Federal aid payment upon our inclination and our ability to provide adequate support for the schools.

If I were a school administrator in Ohio, desperately yearning for additional funds with which to do a better job, I would be most fearful that this pittance from the Federal Government would undermine if not block any effort to increase State and local support.

I would be afraid that my future requests for more State and local money would be met with indifference. "You

are getting it from the Federal Government, now," might be the reply. "Why do you continue to bother us?"

Whatever State and local inclination there may be to do a better job for the schools would be seriously curtailed.

Moreover, the additional tax burden to support the Federal Government would make it more difficult for the State and local governments to raise additional money to support the schools. Heavy Federal taxation is one of the reasons given for the lack of ability of local governments. Increasing the Federal load certainly would make this problem more acute.

No, Mr. Chairman, if I were an Ohio school administrator hopeful of getting enough money to do an outstanding job in my school district, I would oppose this bill because it does not give me enough money to make a real difference and it will be a stumbling block in the path of any campaign to increase State and local aid.

Beyond these considerations lies the problem of Federal control of local schools.

I am fully aware that the bill contains language which purports to remove any possibility of Federal control over the kind or content of instruction. All of this is supposed to be regulated in the States.

But I know that the Federal Office of Education and the National Education Association are eager to promote what they call the excellence of educational opportunity, and they can do so only by imposing their views about curricula, teaching methods, and textbooks on the local school districts. Federal aid is the medium through which they can force the local schools to accept this kind of dictation.

I know further that we here in Congress have the responsibility to see that Federal dollars given to anyone for any purpose are spent wisely and thriftily for that purpose. I insist that we discharge that responsibility to the best of our ability. And the only way we can be certain of this in the field of Federal aid for education is to exercise some control of education. Despite all the protestations and legislative enactments, these are facts. This bill is the foot-in-the-door for Federal control of education; make no mistake about it.

There are many technical reasons why I would oppose this bill even if I were a supporter of the general idea of Federal aid and control of education. I think it is a bad bill.

I am going to vote against it.

Before I close, let me say that for many years I have had pending in the House a bill to provide that 1 percent of the Federal income tax on individuals and corporations collected in each State be returned to that State for use for educational purposes as the legislatures may direct, without Federal control. If we can prove the need for more money for the schools in the various States, this is the avenue I believe we should follow. Let the Federal Government be the tax collector, if the States cannot or will not do the job, but let the Federal Government return all of that tax, without deductions for administrative overhead, without Federal control, for the States to spend. Under my proposal, Ohio's share for the last fiscal year would have been $45,093,910, some $12 million more than provided under title I of the pending bill.

Some of you may recall that the House adopted my bill when it was offered as a substitute to a pending Federal aid measure some years ago. Subsequently that vote was reversed on a rollcall, but I think that it demonstrated the general appeal of the proposal. I was pleased last year to note that a similar method of aiding the States has been considered by the President's economic advisers, and I heartily recommend it in preference to any of the complicated Federal aid formula that are developed in most such bills. This is the one method by which the Federal Government can give financial aid to States without imposing upon them Federal control of the operation of all State agencies.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the events which took place yesterday at Cape Kennedy, Fla., and extending around the world point up in the most dramatic way possible that the United States does not have to take a back seat to anyone in the fields of technical and scientific theory and its application.

It points up the fact that education in the United States—the educational system which is the basis for all our accomplishments in space, in agriculture, in chemicals and plastics, in the ever-growing files in the Patent Office—is at least "pretty good."

I am convinced, however, that pretty good is not good enough for this country. We have the capability and the need to be undisputedly the best in the world. Our educators are the finest, not only in science and technology, but in the liberal arts, in history, in economics, in all the areas worthy of academic study. It is up to us to help these fine teachers educate their students to be the best in the world. I think that this bill takes a giant step toward accomplishing this goal.

We will be hindered in our search for the best so long as there are areas in this country where low incomes mean low revenues which mean inadequate schools for our youth in these areas. The war on poverty is aimed at eliminating the low incomes for as many of these people as possible. But the problem will not be solved as long as some of our schools cannot afford books and equipment necessary for transferring ideas and theories and facts from the minds of the world's great thinkers to the minds of our youth. We must exhaust every possible avenue of seeking new and better ways of teaching and of implementing these methods as we [redacted] them. We must put aside our regional and personal squabbles and do everything within the power of Congress to make our educational goals come true.

No one action taken by Congress can raise education in this country to the unchallenged level of being the best in the world. The problems are too complex and complicated and deep to allow solutions which will solve the problems tomorrow or even next week. But each day that we hesitate, the problems become more serious and more remote from solution. We must act, not rashly, but with speed; we must act with the single criterion of what is best for this country.

I cannot express too strongly my conviction that the bill currently before us would, if passed, be of great value in our move toward the best quality education possible and the best possible society. When we refer to this bill and similar measures as school aid we should keep in mind that this is a misleading term. In reality, this is student aid. Schools and teachers are almost meaningless when separated from the students. A great portion of their value comes from the amount of help they can give students in the various learning processes and stages. The bill now under consideration is a good bill because it does make this distinction. Every proposal is aimed at helping the students. This should be the basis for all such aid proposals.

I am proud and pleased to join the ranks of the supporters of this legislation. I firmly believe that it will be the best way we can help American education to become the undisputed leader of the world and the best way we can make the war on poverty effective not just this year or next year, but for the many years to come.

I urge your support of this great measure.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as the original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965".

TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES AND EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 874, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SEC. 2. The Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by inserting:

"TITLE II—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION BY FEDERAL ACTIVITY"

immediately above the heading of section 1, by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears in sections 1 through 6, inclusive (other than where it appears in clause (B) of section 4(a)), and inserting in lieu thereof "this title", and by adding immediately after section 6 the following new title:

"TITLE II—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

"Declaration of policy

"SEC. 201. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational

programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

"Kinds and duration of grants

"SEC. 202. The Commissioner shall, in accordance with the provisions of this title, make payments to State educational agencies for basic grants to local educational agencies for the period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending June 30, 1968, and he shall make payments to State educational agencies for special incentive grants to local educational agencies for the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1968.

"Basic grants—Amount and eligibility

"SEC. 203. (a)(1) From the sums appropriated for making basic grants under this title for a fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine and shall allot such amount among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for such grants. The maximum basic grant which a local educational agency in Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be eligible to receive shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

"(2) In any case in which the Commissioner determines the satisfactory data for that purpose are available, the maximum basic grant which a local educational agency in a State shall be eligible to receive under this title for any fiscal year shall be (except as provided in paragraph (3)) an amount equal to the Federal percentage (established pursuant to subsection (c)) of the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the sum of (A) the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the school district of such agency, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)), and (B) the number of children of such ages in such school district of families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)) from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act. In any other case, the maximum basic grant for any local educational agency in a State shall be determined on the basis of the aggregate maximum amount of such grants for all such agencies in the county or counties in which the school district of the particular agency is located, which aggregate maximum amount shall be equal to the Federal percentage of such per pupil expenditure multiplied by the number of children of such ages and families in such county or counties and shall be allocated among those agencies upon such equitable basis as may be determined by the State educational agency in accordance with basic criteria prescribed by the Commissioner. For purposes of this subsection the 'average per pupil expenditure' in a State shall be the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, of all local educational agencies in the State (without regard to the sources of funds from which such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year. In determining the maximum amount of a basic grant and the eligibility of a local educational agency for a basic grant for any fiscal year, the number of children determined under the first two sentences of this subsection or under subsection (b) shall be reduced by the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)) for whom a payment was made under title I for the previous fiscal year.

"(3) If the maximum amount of the basic grant determined pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) for any local educational agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, is greater than 30 per centum of the sum budgeted by that agency for current expenditures for that year (as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner), such maximum amount shall be reduced to 30 per centum of such budgeted sum.

"(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'State' does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(b) A local educational agency shall be eligible for a basic grant for a fiscal year under this title only if it meets the following requirements with respect to the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)):

"(1) In any case (except as provided in paragraph (3)) in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection as to the number of such children of such families are available on a school district basis, the number of such children of such families in the school district of such local educational agency shall be—

"(A) at least one hundred, or

"(B) equal to 3 per centum or more of the total number of all children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in such district,

whichever is less, except that it shall in no case be less than ten.

"(2) In any other case, except as provided in paragraph (3), the number of children of such ages of families with such income in the county which includes such local educational agency's school district shall be one hundred or more.

"(3) In any case in which a county includes a part of the school district of the local educational agency concerned and the Commissioner has not determined that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection are available on a school district basis for all the local educational agencies for all the counties into which the school district of the local educational agency concerned extends, the eligibility requirement with respect to the number of children of such ages of families of such income for such local educational agency shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner for the purposes of this subsection.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the 'Federal percentage' and the 'low-income factor' for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall be 50 per centum and $2,000, respectively. For each of the two succeeding fiscal years the Federal percentage and the low-income factor shall be established by the Congress by law.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)) on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce. At any time such data for a county are available in the Department of Commerce, such data shall be used in making calculations under this section. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the number of children of such ages from families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act on the basis of the best available data for the period most nearly comparable to those which are used by the Commissioner under the first two sentences of this subsection in making determinations for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b). When requested by the Commissioner, the Secretary of Commerce shall make a special estimate of the number of children of such ages who are from families having an annual income less than the low income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) in each county or school district, and the Commissioner is authorized to pay (either in advance or by way of reimbursement) to the Secretary of Commerce the cost of making this special estimate. The Secretary of Commerce shall give consideration to any request of the chief executive of a State for the collection of additional census information.

"Special incentive grants

"SEC. 204. Each local educational agency which is eligible to receive a basic grant for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall be eligible to receive in addition a special incentive grant which does not exceed the product of (a) the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agency provided free public education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and (b) the amount by which the average per pupil expenditure of that agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, exceeded 105 per centum of such expenditure for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. Each local educational agency which is eligible to receive a basic grant for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be eligible to receive in addition a special incentive grant which does not exceed the product of (c) the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agency provided free public education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and (d) the amount by which the average per pupil expenditure of that agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, exceeded 110 per centum of such expenditure for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. For the purpose of this section the 'average per pupil expenditure' of a local educational agency for any year shall be the aggregate expenditures (without regard to the sources of funds from which such expenditures are made, except that funds derived from Federal sources shall not be used in computing such expenditures) from current revenues made by that agency during that year for free public education, divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agency provided free public education during that year.

"APPLICATION

"SEC. 205. (a) A local educational agency may receive a basic grant or a special incentive grant under this title for any fiscal year only upon application therefor approved by the appropriate State educational agency, upon its determination (consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish)—

"(1) that payments under this title will be used for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipmeent and where necessary the construction of school facilities) (A) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families and (B) which are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting those needs, and nothing herein shall be deemed to preclude two or more local educational agencies from entering into agreements, at their option, for carrying out jointly operated programs and projects under this title;

"(2) that, to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such agency has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment) in which such children can participate;

"(3) that the local educational agency has provided satisfactory assurance that the control of funds provided under this title, and title to property derived therefrom, shall be in a public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this title, and that a public agency will administer such funds and property;

"(4) in the case of any project for construction of school facilities, that the project is not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities and that the requirements of section 209 will be complied with on all such construction projects;

"(5) that effective procedures, including provision for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children;

"(6) that the local educational agency will make an annual report and such other reports to the State educational agency, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the State educational agency to perform its duties under this title, including information relating to the educational achievement of students participating in programs carried out under the title, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the State educational agency may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(7) that wherever there is, in the area served by the local educational agency, a community action program approved pursuant to title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), the programs and projects have been developed in cooperation with the public or private nonprofit agency responsible for the community action program; and

"(8) that effective procedures will be adopted for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators significant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects, and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices developed through such projects.

"(b) The State educational agency shall not finally disapprove in whole or in part any application for funds under this title without first affording the local educational agency submitting the application reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"Assurances from States

"SEC. 206. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the program of this title shall submit through its State educational agency to the Commissioner an application, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which provides satisfactory assurance—

"(1) that, except as provided in section 207(b), payments under this title will be used only for programs and projects which have been approved by the State educational agency pursuant to section 205(a) and which meet the requirements of that section, and that such agency will in all other respects comply with the provisions of this title, including the enforcement of any obligations imposed upon a local educational agency under section 205(a);

"(2) that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this title; and

"(3) that the State educational agency will make to the Commissioner (A) periodic reports (including the results of objective measurements required by section 205(a)(5)) evaluating the effectiveness of payments under this title and of particular programs assisted under it in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and (B) such other reports as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title (including such reports as he may require to determine the amounts which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive for any fiscal year), and assurance that such agency will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application which meets the requirements specified in subsection (a), and he shall not finally disapprove an application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State educational agency.

"Payment

"SEC. 207. (a)(1) The Commissioner shall, subject to the provisions of section 208, from time to time pay to each State, in advance or otherwise, the amount which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive under this title. Such payments shall take into account the extent (if any) to which any previous payment to such State educational agency under this title (whether or not in the same fiscal year) was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to it.

"(2) From the funds paid to it pursuant to paragraph (1) each State educational agency shall distribute to each local educational agency of the State which is not ineligible by reason of section 203(b) and which has submitted an application approved pursuant to section 205(a) the amount for which such application has been approved, except that this amount shall not exceed an amount equal to the total of the maximum amount of the basic grant plus the maximum amount of the special incentive grant as determined for that agency pursuant to sections 203 and 204, respectively.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to pay to each State amounts equal to the amounts expended by it for the proper and efficient performance of its duties under this title (including technical assistance for the measurements and evaluations required by section 205(a)(5)), except that the total of such payments in any fiscal year shall not exceed 1 per centum of the total of the amount of the basic grants paid under this title for that year to the local educational agencies of the State.

"(c)(1) No payments shall be made under this title for any fiscal year to a State which has taken into consideration payments under this title in determining the eligibility of any local educational agency in that State for State aid, or the amount of that aid, with respect to the free public education of children during that year or the preceding fiscal year.

"(2) No payments shall be made under this title to any local educational agency for any fiscal year unless the State educational agency finds that the combined fiscal effort (as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner) of that agency and the State with respect to the provision of free public education by that agency for the preceding fiscal year was not less than such combined fiscal effort for that purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

"Adjustments where necessitated by appropriations

"SEC. 208. If the sums appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for making the payments provided in this title are not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which all local and State educational agencies are eligible to receive under this title for such year, such amounts shall be reduced ratably. In case additional funds become available for making payments under this title for that year, such reduced amounts shall be increased on the same basis that they were reduced.

"Labor standards

"SEC. 209. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"Withholding

"SEC. 210. Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any State educational agency, finds that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any assurance set forth in the application of that State approved under section 206(b), the Commissioner shall notify the agency that further payments will not be made to the State under this title (or, in his discretion, that the State educational agency shall not make further payments under this title to specified local educational agencies affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to the State under this title, or payments by the State educational agency under this title shall be limited to local educational agencies not affected by the failure, as the case may be.

"Judicial review

"SEC. 211. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its application submitted under section 206(a) or with his final action under section 210, such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"National Advisory Council

"SEC. 212. (a) The President shall, within ninety days after the enactment of this title, appoint a National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and making recommendations for the improvement of this title and its administration and operation. These recommendations shall take into consideration experience gained under this and other Federal educational programs for disadvantaged children and, to the extent appropriate, experience gained under other public and private educational programs for disadvantaged children.

"(b) The Council shall be appointed by the President without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons. When requested by the President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Council, and the Secretary shall make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

"(c) The Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title) to the President not later than March 31 of each calendar year beginning after the enactment of this title. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

"(d) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (interrupting the reading of the bill). A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Are the committee amendments being considered at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. We are reading the bill by sections. When the section is completed, amendments will be in order. This section will not be completed until line 2, page 89, has been read.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then the committee amendments will be considered first?

The CHAIRMAN. Then amendments will be in order.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the Chairman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. GREEN OF OREGON

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: On page 72, beginning with line 3, strike out "(except as provided in paragraph (3)) an amount equal to the Federal percentage (established pursuant to subsection (c)) of the average per pupil expenditure in that State" and insert in lieu thereof "an amount equal to the Federal share (established pursuant to subsection (c))".

On page 72, line 21, strike out "percentage of such per pupil expenditure" and insert in lieu thereof "share (established pursuant to subsection (c))".

On page 73, beginning on line 1, strike out "For purposes of this sub-" and all that follows down through the period on line 9.

On page 73, beginning on line 19, strike out everything down through line 2 on page 74, and on page 74, line 3, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

On page 75, beginning on line 18, strike out "percentage" and insert in lieu thereof "share".

On page 75, line 20, strike out "50 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "$200".

On page 75, line 22, strike out "percentage" and insert in lieu thereof "share".

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, in general debate I tried to outline the purpose of this particular amendment. It seems to me that if we really intend to do what we say in the policy statement in the bill, that this legislation is for educationally deprived children and for the "poor child" as defined in the bill as one who comes from a family that has less than a $2,000 income, then there is no justification for an allocation formula that would distribute the funds to give the richest States the most money.

May I call your attention to the fact that in arriving at the total amount that is spent in a State, this includes funds from local sources, State sources and Federal sources. In this bill there is wide variation—but in each case it works out so the poorest States with the highest number of educationally disadvantaged get the smallest amount of money. As I mentioned previously, it goes from $120 for each poor child as defined in the bill in the State of Mississippi, which has a per capita income of $1,379, to $353 for every poor child as defined in the bill in the State of New York with a per capita income of $3,000. The States which have the most get the most.

The amendment which I propose, it seems to me, is based on justice and on equity. It would simply say that the total amount that is estimated as the cost of this title of the bill, $1,060 million would be divided by the total number of poor children eligible under the definition. This actually amounts to $201.17. In order to simplify the matter we have taken the figure of $200. My amendment would simply provide a formula so that every poor child as defined in the bill would get $200, whether that child lives in Mississippi or New York, or Oregon or the District of Columbia.

If I may quickly go down the list of States at the present time for those of you who have not looked at the chart, the present formula provides:

Funds under title I of H.R. 2362

	Per capita personal income, 1963	Estimated number of children in poverty category as defined in H.R. 2362, as reported	Estimated allocation of funds under title I of H.R. 2362, as reported	Estimated amount received per child in poverty category under title I of H.R. 2362	Effort index based on per capita income, 1963–64, percent
National average	$2,443				4.60
Alabama	1,656	226,700	$31,738,000	$140	4.21
Alaska	2,819	5,299	1,430,938	270	5.41
Arizona	2,115	42,890	9,757,481	227	5.93
Arkansas	1,598	139,702	21,095,002	151	5.09
California	2,930	276,093	73,145,300	265	5.53
Colorado	2,386	37,784	8,454,110	223	5.45
Connecticut	3,162	25,997	7,175,172	276	3.84
Delaware	3,250	7,899	1,966,851	249	3.98
District of Columbia	3,398	17,924	4,633,354	258	2.69
Florida	2,111	143,795	27,896,230	194	4.45
Georgia	1,865	225,699	34,517,871	153	4.43
Hawaii	2,476	10,585	2,127,785	201	3.97
Idaho	1,934	15,136	2,311,382	152	4.37
Illinois	2,945	181,047	43,360,809	239	3.71
Indiana	2,475	80,398	18,772,978	233	4.82
Iowa	2,274	75,988	17,325,264	228	5.05
Kansas	2,231	44,560	9,752,736	218	5.60
Kentucky	1,789	188,101	28,215,150	150	3.77
Louisiana	1,768	189,996	37,904,234	199	5.64
Maine	2,008	20,673	3,907,179	189	4.44
Maryland	2,778	58,716	14,356,074	244	4.41
Massachusetts	2,850	58,959	13,988,754	237	3.26
Michigan	2,528	144,908	32,729,320	226	4.97
Minnesota	2,332	82,092	20,876,677	254	5.65
Mississippi	1,379	232,603	28,028,704	120	5.04
Missouri	2,508	128,242	26,866,755	209	3.73
Montana	$2,239	15,967	$3,750,273	$234	5.63
Nebraska	2,293	36,093	6,793,169	188	4.26
Nevada	3,372	3,414	658,184	191	4.48
New Hampshire	2,303	7,540	1,609,796	213	4.14
New Jersey	2,900	71,113	20,196,092	283	4.14
New Mexico	1,887	40,634	8,931,560	220	6.57
New York	3,000	260,764	91,893,253	353	4.69
North Carolina	1,813	303,475	48,556,000	160	4.71
North Dakota	2,030	24,323	5,069,610	208	5.57
Ohio	2,483	164,613	36,708,699	223	4.48
Oklahoma	1,953	88,966	15,596,196	175	4.58
Oregon	2,515	29,190	7,893,807	270	5.51
Pennsylvania	2,444	204,287	49,519,506	242	3.76
Rhode Island	2,398	14,986	3,746,500	250	4.06
South Carolina	1,584	192,597	25,519,125	132	4.54
South Dakota	1,932	31,232	6,249,152	200	5.33
Tennessee	1,776	213,694	31,092,525	145	4.23
Texas	2,046	386,599	74,580,048	193	4.81
Utah	2,129	13,989	2,627,783	187	6.31
Vermont	2,092	8,043	1,556,327	193	4.24
Virginia	2,066	168,285	29,433,775	175	4.22
Washington	2,505	44,195	11,275,168	255	5.60
West Virginia	1,872	104,943	15,741,450	150	4.37
Wisconsin	2,380	64,653	16,078,428	248	4.72
Wyoming	2,427	5,817	1,470,960	253	6.08
U.S. total		5,161,198	1,060,082,973		

A poor child in the State of Alabama under this formula would get $140. One in Arkansas, would get $151. One in Florida would get $194. If you have one in Georgia, $153. If you have one in Idaho, $152. If you have one in Kentucky, $150. If you have one in Mississippi, $120. If you have one in Nebraska, $188. If you have one in North Carolina, $160. If you have one in Oklahoma, $175. If you have one in South Carolina, $132. If you have one in Tennessee, $145. If you have one in Virginia, $175.

The wealthier States, of course, get a great deal more. As I stated, New York has the highest, and New Jersey has the second highest, $283.

May I suggest that the equitable way would be to divide it so that every poor child, no matter where he lives, gets an identical amount so that the educational service in that district could be improved.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Oregon has so distinguished herself in the contribution she has made to the cause of higher education, we all esteem her so highly, that it is with the greatest diffidence that I rise to oppose anything she advocates in this House. However, this is a very vital matter which is now involved. The outcome of the vote on this amendment may have a very material influence on whether or not this bill will be enacted.

I appreciate the sincerity of the gentlewoman in presenting the formula which she has offered to this House, but I respectfully suggest that she has mistaken the concepts upon which this bill is designed. I beg your attention to page 70 of the bill:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not designed to bring the expenditure for all children in the elementary and secondary schools of America up to the same level. I hope some day we shall see the Congress provide an equalization fund, as is provided in many of our States, to bring into the poorer States an expenditure per pupil up to the level of the richer or at least to the level of the average, both in the counties and the States. But we are taking the first step, and the first step is to help the local community bring the educational expenditure for deprived children up to the level of the ordinary children who are not in the deprived class. That is what the gentlewoman overlooks.

She is asking us to take the total amount provided by this bill divided by the total number of eligible children and give the same amount to each. That is an equalization per child, but it violates the concept upon which this legislation is designed, namely, to give assistance to the local school authorities in giving the same educational opportunity to the deprived child as is given to the normal child.

Now, do the advocates of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, propose that a child, let us say, in Mississippi or Alabama or in any other State where the expenditure per pupil is about one-third of what it is in the State of New York—as I say—do the advocates of this amendment propose that the Federal Government is to say that every deprived child in the State of Mississippi is to get three times as much spent upon that child as is spent upon the individual deprived child in the State of New York? Are we going to make the deprived child superior in Mississippi and inferior in New York to his nondeprived fellow pupils? That would be the inevitable effect of that principle being applied in New York. You would give New York for the deprived child only about one-third of what the expenditure is for each one of the ordinary children not in the deprived class in the schools.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am sorry the gentleman misunderstood. I did not suggest for one moment that a child in Mississippi or Alabama would get three times the amount a child would get in the State of New York. I suggested that this formula is unfair because we give New York three times the amount given to Mississippi. Liberals talk about Mississippi and Alabama and we shed crocodile tears about how awful conditions are down there and we know many have been educationally deprived for a long time; then when we have a chance to do something—we give New York three times what we will give them in Mississippi and Alabama.

The purpose of my amendment is not as you have stated it—I never suggested that we give children in Mississippi or Alabama three times as much as in New York—quite the contrary. I object to giving children who already have good schools three times as much as those children who are so deprived. You and I and others cry about it and say how awful it is. Now we have a chance to do something about it besides just talk about it. It seems to me—and I suppose it is an unladylike statement—but I think this is the time to either put up or shut up. Do we mean that we want to help these States or do we just want to talk?

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentlewoman for corroborating my argument because she said that while she did not intend to give the deprived child in Mississippi three times as much as it would otherwise get, inevitably if you take all the money and divide it equally among all the children, the children will get an average expenditure which inevitably will be more than the average child gets in Mississippi and less than the average child gets in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Now, Mr. Chairman, to indicate how this works out, the State of Mississippi, and I have a formula here, has 233,000 children in the deprived class. Mississippi would get a total of $28 million—22.4 percent of its total expenditure would be provided by the Federal Government under this bill.

Whereas the State of California would only get 3 percent of its total expenditure and the State of New York would get 3.8 percent of its expenditure under this bill.

In other words, what we are doing here today, I hope, is to say that we will give incentive to the districts and to the States that spend less and we will encourage the States that spend more in an effort to try to raise the quality of education for all the children of the country.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. GIBBONS. Talking about incentive and effort, I have a table that I want to insert in the RECORD at the end of this debate that shows something about incentive and effort. I think this table was compiled by the National Education Association. It shows unequivocally that in these wealthier and more affluent States, they are not trying any harder than these poor little States. In fact, the State of Mississippi which ranks 50th in ability to pay, ranks 5th in effort to support education in their communities. While we are talking about rewarding States and helping States, I think it is important to point that out. The poor States cannot put up any more money. These poor States simply do not have the resources.

Mr. PEPPER. May I reply to my eminent colleague. The gentleman said that some of the States cannot provide adequate educational opportunity to all of its children. That is what we propose to help them do by this legislation. But do we desire to raise the level of expenditure for the deprived child in Mississippi above the expenditure in Mississippi for all other children? Why are they to be preferred in Federal assistance, compared to the other children in Mississippi? That is what we are talking about now.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has made a very outstanding speech and has contributed considerably to the discussion.

If the argument of the gentleman's colleague were valid, this should not be a bill to aid the disadvantaged student,

but it should be a bill to equalize educational expenditures throughout the United States. If it is valid to say that because one State tries harder than another—if that is the argument—then these funds should be distributed on the basis of effort. If it is valid to say that one State cannot do more, then these funds should be distributed on the basis of inability to pay. That does not recognize the educational system of this country. As the gentleman has so well said, it does not recognize what we are trying to do in this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able leader for so succinctly stating the question.

We all know that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the other body, Senator HILL of Alabama, has been the father of the appropriations made under the Hill-Burton Act. One would naturally surmise that a formula which would apply to the distribution of Hill-Burton funds, offered by the able Senator from Alabama, would not be unfair to his State or to the South.

I have a comparison of the funds available to the several States if the Hill-Burton formula were applied to the distribution of these funds compared to what would happen if the formula provided in the present bill were used. May I refer to Alabama. If the Hill-Burton formula were applied, Alabama would get $25 million. Under the formula embodied in this bill Alabama would get $31 million. Is that discriminatory against Alabama?

Mississippi, under the Hill-Burton formula, would get $18 million. Mississippi, under the formula in the present bill, contrary to the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon, would get $28 million.

Therefore, I believe that is proof positive that a distinguished Member of the other body very much concerned about the South has laid down a formula which would not give the South as much as the formula proposed in this bill.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to point out a fact here which I believe is important, because it affects the State of Florida, the State of the gentleman who previously spoke in the well of the House.

A point has been made here that this is a bad bill. The point we are arguing on now is whether the distribution formula is good or bad. I take the position that so far as the State of Florida is concerned the distribution is very bad.

Let me point out a fact which affects the State of Florida. I am not certain whether it affects other States or not. Within the State of Florida many years ago, we enacted, to help our educational program along, what we call a minimum foundation plan for our public schools. The point was that many of our counties were poor, and some of our counties were wealthy, and we would take money away from the wealthy counties and give it to the poorer counties in order to "beef up" their educational system.

This arrangement worked fairly well until World War II came along, when we had a population explosion in Florida. Now it does not work well at all, because our wealthy counties now, which are generally our fast-growing counties, are not getting the amount of money they ought to be getting out of this minimum foundation plan. However, now along comes this education bill we are discussing here today on the floor and which the gentleman from Florida so eloquently spoke on a moment ago. Let me tell you what this does as between two congressional districts in Florida. One that I speak of is my own congressional district and the other I will not name so that I will not embarrass anyone, but it is a congressional district which is less than one-half the size of mine. That congressional district, with less than half the pupils that are in my congressional district, will get considerably more funds than mine, that is, $2 million total. My district gets about $1.8 million. However, this is the point I want to make here: In that congressional district which gets more money, the amount of money paid per-pupil-cost is about the same. They are getting just about the same. They have no classroom shortage. All of the pupils are housed in this congressional district, whereas in my congressional district there are 346 additional classrooms that are needed right now to house the pupils there now. Sixty-five replacement classrooms are needed in my district almost at once, in addition, or a total of 411. Thousands of the pupils in my district are attending double sessions and are housed in temporary facilities. We actually have a higher pupil load per teacher than the other congressional district has. Now here is the important point. Moneys for schools in Florida come from four sources, local taxes, State allocations to the counties, part of a racing tax, and Federal moneys. My county raises 38.9 percent of its school money from local taxes, the other district raises 19.6 percent. To put it another way money from my district raised by State taxes goes into the other district for 71.4 percent of school money in the other district comes from State taxes, only 52.8 percent in my district.

Under the formula in this bill this other district, with far less needs than my district, bearing far less of its tax load than mine, with less than half the school students gets more money. Federal tax money will go out of my district into this other district, the formula of money distribution here is not only unfair, it is fantastically ridiculous.

Now I will say this: All of these figures so far as the gentleman's own congressional district is concerned are even worse, so that his people are really getting the short end of the stick under this particular proposal here, and I would not be surprised if other States probably suffer the same inequity, in their congressional districts.

This is a bad distribution system, and I support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his contribution.

Listening to the arguments of the other gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], I get the feeling that he thinks the wealthy school districts of the country are ignoring the needs of their educationally deprived children and are not providing education for them. Let us take Montgomery County, Md., which is the wealthiest county in the United States. Are they ignoring, absolutely ignoring, the needs of the educationally deprived children there? I doubt it. They have the money to take care of all children's educational needs. The amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon would simply provide that Montgomery County would receive the same amount of money per pupil who comes from a family with an income of less than $2,000 as a child in Mississippi—an equal amount.

Let me point out, Mr. Chairman, last year what happened with the educational legislation. That was called by some the "education Congress." We had the vocational education bill and the higher education bill, which had an allotment formula. Let me point out in those two bills, the higher education bill and the vocational education bill, the formula we finally had to agree to with the Senate provided that the poorer States would receive more per child than the wealthier States. That is the way the Federal Government assisted the States in educational legislation before when it saw fit to put in an allotment formula to assist the poorer States more than the wealthy States. However, we have a bill before us now which provides greater amounts of aid to the wealthy States and wealthy school districts. It was pointed out that the 10 wealthiest school districts or wealthiest counties in the country will get about twice as much money as the 10 poorest counties in the country with about the same number of children in them. Or, as the gentlewoman from Oregon has so well pointed out, in the State of New York each school district would receive $353 per pupil, while in Mississippi they receive $120 per pupil. All she is asking is that we make it fair and equal for everyone and that each school district receive the same amount per child.

If the truth were known New York is already spending a great deal for their educationally deprived children. New York is spending perhaps more for her educationally deprived children than she is for the other children and she has the money to finance that. But I would say that the amendment of the gentlewoman

from Oregon really gives a great deal to the State of New York compared to what we have done in previous years in education bills. She has stated that we should give them all equal amounts. The problem in Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas, and the poorer States as it has been told to me by my colleagues from those States has been that they do not even have the buildings in some cases for these young people.

They are overcrowded. I heard one of my colleagues say that you could throw a dog through the cracks in some of the school buildings. Surely they need buildings, and they need teachers, and they need the entire program for educationally deprived kids. That is going to cost a great deal more money even though it is the South than it would for the additional services for educationally deprived children in New York or California or Illinois or any of the wealthier States where many of the facilities are already available.

So, if we are ever going to help the South where the poorer children are we have got to do at least this much in the allotment formula. I have said many times that if we had treated the South immediately after the Civil War as well as we have treated West Germany and Japan after World War II none of these problems would be before us today. Coming from the North we suffer, because our ancestors caused that to happen. Now today we say that these wealthy States should have more than the poor States; New York three times as much as Mississippi. Today we can at least even things up and in this allotment formula give each of them an equal amount according to the number of children that they have.

Certainly, if the people in the South have more of those children they will receive more money, but they should receive the same amount of money per child as anyone else in the country.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his remarks and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following those of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I say this to you: Let us not be the sapless branch of this Government, as one of our colleagues from the other body titled his book, a sapless branch that cannot change a thing in this bill because the executive branch says, "Do not accept any amendments to the bill." If we, in our good judgment, think that this would be a better allotment formula, let us have courage enough, starch enough in our spines to approve the amendment to the bill. It might take a few more days to pass the bill in the Congress, but we are a long way before this Congress adjourns. Let us show that there is some independent judgment on our part. That is the only way this Congress will ever amount to something in the fabric of our governmental system in these United States, that we take some action like this today. I believe now is our opportunity to show that we have some independent judgment of our own.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I believe that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] while standing in the same position in which he is now standing stated on yesterday that he is opposed to Federal aid to private or public schools at the primary or secondary level?

Mr. QUIE. Broad, general aid yes, but I supported the vocational education bill as passed by the House last year as I did National Defense Education Act.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Is the gentleman now suggesting that if the amendment which has been offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is adopted to this bill, the gentleman would be willing to support it and to provide that kind of aid to both private and public schools at the primary and secondary level?

Mr. QUIE. If title I could be separated from the other titles, my answer would be "yes." As I indicated yesterday I have some objections to titles II, III, and IV but if some of the amendments which will be offered are adopted to this bill, I would support the entire bill at that time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

This amendment will bring the bill in line with the objective, that is, provide equal educational opportunity for all children of America. It is in the name and interest of the poor children of our Nation that this bill was submitted to the Congress. But, as the gentlewoman from Oregon has so well pointed out, the formula provides for a most inequitable distribution of funds. As she has said, the formula would make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

The State of Mississippi, from whence I hail, has for years made an effort toward education unequalled by any other State in the Union. While we do not have the taxable resources and revenues equivalent to that of other States, the facts are that we have over the years led all States in dividing our tax revenues with education. As of this moment we are not the leading State in this respect but we are fifth, exceeded only by Utah, New Mexico, Alaska, and Louisiana.

Furthermore, there is no discrimination, none whatsoever, in the distribution of our education dollar as between white and colored teachers or students. True, our average teacher payment is low as compared with the national average. Nevertheless both white and colored are paid under the same formula. Identical salaries are paid to those with identical degrees and identical years of service.

There is no discrimination in the capital investment in our school facilities. Mr. Chairman, I doubt that any State has made greater struggle to improve the educational standards of its people than has the State of Mississippi. True, we are far, far behind in the tax dollar spent per pupil as compared with the tax dollar spent in other States, and particularly the wealthy States. I repeat, however, that we stand high in the effort index and are surpassed by only four States in the distribution of our tax dollars to education.

Regrettably, we have a number of poor children in our State. We want to train, educate, and rear these children to be skilled adults, capable of making a material contribution to the welfare and progress of our country.

The amendment offered by our colleague from Oregon is designed to do equity to the poor. It is designed to bring the bill in line with the objective, that is, to offer equal educational opportunity to all alike. This can only be done by the adoption of her amendment.

I hope the amendment will have the approval of this body.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I also am going to criticize this formula, but from a somewhat different point of view.

Mr. Chairman, the real objection to this formula is that it does not recognize the difference between the level of income that means poverty in one part of this country and the income level that means poverty in another part of the country.

Mr. Chairman, if $2,000 a year is poverty in the Delta, then $5,000 is "poor" in Chicago and $6,000 would be "poor" in New York.

When we count deprived children under this formula we are counting a lot of children in the rural Southern States that are no worse off than children from families with higher incomes in some of the northern industrial States. The payment of the State average per pupil cost of education for each deprived child is an attempt to partially offset this inequity.

If instead we take that inequity and compound it, as the Green amendment would do, we will have created a monster.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] pointed out, the Hill-Burton formula—and that is what we used to have the fights about on aid bills; remember, we would come in with a bill from the committee that provided so much per schoolchild and someone would rise and offer the Hill-Burton equalization formula which was supposed to favor the low income southern rural States—well, as the gentleman from Florida pointed out, the formula contained in this bill right now does better by the Southern States than any formula that has ever passed this Congress. It does better by the South than the Hill-Burton formula, it does better by the South than the poverty formula in the Landrum bill of last year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Oregon has proposed an amendment to exaggerate that advantage.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] would support this bill if her amendment were

adopted and she may even support it if her amendment is not adopted. But many of those who are supporting this amendment and who intend to vote for this amendment, are doing so not with the intention of supporting this bill if the amendment passes, but with the intention of opposing this bill regardless and they hope that others will join them if the change they advocate is agreed to.

It may not be a vain hope, Mr. Chairman. The adoption of the Green amendment would reduce the allocation to the State of California by some $18 million. It would reduce the amount allocated to the State of New York by some $40 million.

Mr. Chairman, these States have large delegations and their interest in this amendment is obvious.

So, this is a good bill. This is the best formula that could be obtained for the South and for everyone else. If we want this bill we had better protect this formula.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the very able gentleman from Michigan for making crystal clear the equitable foundation upon which this bill rests. I am from a district and State which on the surface would appear to benefit by the formula offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon, but I have to be realistic. I know that in the national view the bill which has been reported by this committee is the attainable objective before us, and if we want a bill that will do something about the problem of education where we have these poor children and poor families, we must support the committee bill or we will have nothing.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I could not agree with the gentleman more.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I too want to compliment the gentleman, and I would like to point out to the committee that in the City of Los Angeles there are more than 900,000 people who live in families with less than $6,000 a year income. In other words, that little city, if it was taken out, would rank ninth in the country. Under the Green amendment we would be making that poverty situation worse than it is at the present time. We would be raising poverty instead of doing something about it. We in Los Angeles welcome those who join in from other States. The committee formula helps us take care of these people. The Green amendment would seriously hinder our efforts to do so.

I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the gentleman agree that during his years in the House the history of legislation in this field is strewn with the wreckage caused by so-called improvements made on the floor?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Yes; and I am afraid that this amendment would improve the bill right down the drain. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I think it is only fair to point out that if this amendment were to prevail certainly some of us on this side would be constrained to offer another amendment later on to Public Law 874 which would provide, among other things, in order to be consistent with the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon, that the local contribution rate under Public Law 874 for each local educational agency shall be equal to the average per-pupil expenditure in the United States for the preceding year.

My distinguished colleague from Minnesota earlier today said on this floor that of the $350 million that is being spent annually under Public Law 874 for impacted areas, about $150 million goes down the drain. As a matter of fact, I believe he used the word "boondoggle." He was disturbed that I would not yield to him previously. I shall be happy to yield to him now so that I may ask him if he would support the amendment to bring 874 into conformity with the amendment that is now before us?

Obviously we have two proposals in this bill. We have one proposal to help educate the deprived children of America, and we have another proposal to continue Public Law 874 for 2 more years. Under the present structure, we would have the Federal Government under 874 paying one-half of what it costs to educate the child in each district. The committee proposal in the Education Act is based on that same concept and continues this concept to help educate children from impoverished families. The gentlewoman from Oregon has proposed a new concept in title I. She wants the money distributed on the basis of a national norm instead of one-half the cost in each respective district. It would appear to me if your are going to adopt a national norm in title I as suggested by the gentlewoman from Oregon, we ought to be consistent in Public Law 874 and provide the same distribution concept based on a national norm instead of paying one-half the cost in each individual school district.

Mr. QUIE. If this amendment prevails I would be happy to adopt the same kind of amendment for 874, if the gentleman would agree to change 874 to conform with the formula at present in the bill if the Green amendment does not prevail. He knows they are not identical now. He knows that the school districts which do not receive as much as the national average under Public Law 874 can elect to receive the national average, the national average that the gentlewoman from Oregon is trying to get for all schools by her amendment. Her amendment will make the formula in this bill more like Public Law 874 than is the case now for poor States.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I doubt if my colleague could think for one second that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon even comes close to the concept of distribution in Public Law 874. Now I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida if he would support the same amendment to Public Law 874, to make it consistent with the amendment to title I suggested by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes, I would.

Mr. PUCINSKI. You who are tempted to support Mrs. GREEN's amendment should know what you are doing. If you adopt the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon, you are inviting a wholesale revision of Public Law 874. I should like to make it crystal clear that the adoption of Mrs. GREEN's amendment to title I, must bring similar amendments to Public Law 874 if the Congress is to be consistent. I am sure you do not want a double standard in this bill.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman from Oregon knows I am a great admirer of hers, but everybody is entitled to an occasional error, and I think this is the error of the gentlewoman from Oregon.

She is placing a premium on a State failing to meets its educational responsibilities. She is in effect arguing the same way the young man argued when he shot his parents and came before the judge and pleaded for mercy on the ground that he was an orphan.

She is making these arguments, I would also point out, in behalf of States which constantly are warning us against a Federal octopus, against Federal control and intervention, but whose officials stand in line asking for more, like Oliver Twist.

It has been said that these States cannot afford the cost of education. I will offer them some free advice as to how they can afford it. They can afford it by racially integrating their educational facilities, and I am not talking about token integration, I am talking about real integration. I'm talking of eliminating duplication and waste by desegregating public schools.

I should like to remind the gentlewoman from Oregon that the Civil Rights Act provides that no State that fails to integrate can get any Federal funds; so whatever she is proposing may not work out and may be entirely academic.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. When the gentleman says these States are not adequately supporting their schools, may I point out that the State the gentleman comes from has the second highest amount of any State in the Union, $287 under this formula.

The effort index for New Jersey is 4.14. The national average is 4.6.

Alabama is making a greater effort in terms of per capita income than is the State of New Jersey; and the State of Mississippi is making a much greater effort than is the State of New Jersey in terms of the dollars they have. You and I agree on civil rights. We have never

had any dispute on this, but the situation today does seem strange to me. You and I both have applauded people who have been and are willing to go into these States and give their lives for that in which they believe, but we are not apparently willing to send any dollars. That is really something I do not quite understand.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The gentlewoman from Oregon has just cast a grave doubt in my mind as to the validity of this index that she has been referring to here today. I recall vividly that the testimony before our subcommittee indicated that New Jersey has the highest local property tax rates in the entire United States for the support of education. When witnesses for cities like Trenton were testifying before us, they indicated that 88 percent of the total cost of education was supported by local individual property taxpayers in New Jersey. We were utterly startled when we discovered what a normal workingman's home was assessed for school taxes in the State of New Jersey and in Michigan, for example, we were doing very well and we discovered really that they are not paying taxes very heavily at all in comparison to the State of New Jersey. If the State of New Jersey ranks very low on this index to which the gentlewoman from Oregon has referred, then I have very serious doubts as to the validity of the figures that she is giving us here today.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. I know the gentleman from Michigan wants to be correct. He referred to the effort index of the States. I have some published figures here given to me by the Library of Congress on the 50 States starting first and greatest effort, the State of Utah and these figures show that the State of New Jersey ranks 41 in effort. In other words the State of New Jersey is not trying very hard.

Mr. JOELSON. I am not here pleading for New Jersey. I am pleading for justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois a few moments ago spoke about the present law and the impacted areas section of this law, Public Law 874. I believe he was in error, Mr. Chairman. Because the present law specifically provides that either a State average, the average cost for educating the public school pupil within the State, or the national average may be used. This is exactly the same except for the matter of a few dollars, as the amendment the gentlewoman from Oregon has offered. The gentleman from Illinois is wrong in his concept of the present law and impacted areas program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would suggest that the gentleman from Nebraska take another look at that law because the gentleman will find that under Public Law 874 the Federal Government pays one-half of the school district average. This bill provides one-half of the State average.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Or one-half of the national average.

Mr. PUCINSKI. One-half of the school district. And the gentleman from Illinois is not wrong.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Or one-half of the national average. I would call the attention again to the gentleman from Illinois that that is specifically in the present law on impacted areas and one-half of that may be paid to those school districts.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, if he would go over and talk to Dr. Wolfe about this and some of the people who know Public Law 874, he would not say what he has just said. The gentleman from Nebraska who has worked on the impact legislation and who has worked on it for a long time, knows well that the school district has a choice either of receiving 50 percent of the State expenditure or 50 percent of the national average—whichever is highest.

And the States of Alabama and Mississippi under Public Law 874 have an opportunity to receive the national average. The gentlewoman from Oregon's amendment says—let everybody take the national average and be fair to all. Also, I would point out to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] that if he would look at the State of New Jersey, he cannot consider only property taxes. New Jersey has never gotten around to levying income taxes or sales taxes. When you determine the effort index, you take what taxes from all sources which are paid for education and compare it with the per capita income. Other States must include their nonproperty taxes which are spent for education when their effort index is figured. We find that New Jersey is not high on the effort index even though she has a high property tax.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Again I should like to call attention to the fact the gentlewoman's amendment follows out the present law, Public Law 874, in regard to impacted areas.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the process of hearings one of the things which became apparent to many of us on the subcommittee considering this legislation was that the allocation formula, although superficially attractive, was extremely discriminatory as to certain parts of the country.

I have heard today the statement that it costs more to help a poor child in Westchester County, or some county of that nature, than it does in Mississippi or Alabama. I cannot understand that kind of viewpoint. What we are saying, in effect, when we accept that statement, is that the more money a district has the more money it should get, the wealthier a county is the more money it should get, because in the wealthy counties it costs more to take care of the poor children. Does that really make sense?

I believe we do have some higher labor costs in Westchester County, perhaps, than in Mississippi. There are some other additional costs. But to say that we should change the old system of allocation we have had in the past in other aid bills and put in an allocation formula which rewards the rich seems to me to be completely contradictory.

Last year, in the vocational education and higher education bills, we accepted formulas which would allocate more money to the areas of greatest need.

The majority leader a few minutes ago said that this should be a bill to equalize education expenditures. How, may I ask, are we to equalize educational expenditures around this country when we give, under this formula, $350 to New York State and only $120 to the State of Mississippi per pupil? Is this the way to equalize educational expenditures?

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will pass. I believe sincerely that if we are going to enact a program of massive Federal expenditures to help poor children in this country, we should do it to help them where the poor children are. We should do it on a fair basis which gives the same amount per child to every area of this country.

The built-in equalization and the built-in extra benefit to some of our poorer States will accomplish precisely the purpose of this legislation as it has been enunciated by its sponsors.

I compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon for offering this amendment, which in many respects meets the objections raised by the Republicans on the committee during the hearings and during the deliberations on this bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. During the last session of the Congress, I was interested in a particular amendment on the defense appropriation bill, and the gentlewoman from Oregon, at the time this amendment was being considered, spoke up and said that although she seldom agreed with me on most issues she felt on that issue the position I had taken was right.

I was grateful for her support at that time. On this occasion I am delighted to have an opportunity to reciprocate, because I believe in this instance she is right. The formula that she is presenting to the Committee is a formula by any criterion which is preferable to the one contained in the bill. Furthermore, I think for those of us who are jealous of the prerogatives, the rights, of the leg-

islative branch, that we should without question take the hearings and see that the hearings prove that the formula recommended by the administration does need revision and does need adjustment.

I compliment the men and women of the Committee on Education and Labor who, through their interrogation, have shown convincingly that this formula in the bill needs revision. I thoroughly endorse the petition taken by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and support the position taken by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and others in behalf of this amendment.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to indicate my provincialism as a New Yorker. The word "New York" has been bruited about in the well of the House today. The wealth of New York has been greatly stressed. But we are not talking about New York's wealth today but of our disadvantages, and we do have disadvantages. New York has disadvantages in many of our counties—yes, in Westchester County, too. I think we should spread on the RECORD here for the benefit of my colleagues from New York, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], just what this change in formula will do to our State's allotment. The State of New York under the formula now will receive a total of $91 million. This change in formula drops us down to $52 million or a loss of $40 million to our State. This would be all right—and let us be generous about this—if we could educate the disadvantaged children of New York, over 250,000 of them—and there are more deprived children in New York City day after day—if we could educate these children at Mississippi prices. However, we cannot educate New York children at the average prices somewhere else, we have to pay the actual costs in New York for this program. This is bound up with heating and building schools and paying teachers' salaries. We have a collective-bargaining agreement which covers our teachers' salaries, so we have to pay the going price for salaries. If we are going to educate disadvantaged children, we have to meet that price. This formula change would just about wipe out the entire city of New York in the bill. The city allotment of the State's $91 million would be $40 million. If you cut the State back $50 million, we would be losing substantially half of the benefits that need to go to the disadvantaged children in New York, in Harlem, Bedford, Stuyvesant, Red Hook, yes Suffolk, and even Westchester County.

I would like to yield to my colleague from Westchester County, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER], who knows something about poverty. It may be something of an anachronism, but he does.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, if I did not know something about poverty before running for public office, I do now.

I have heard Westchester County disparaged by the gentleman from New York time and again during this debate. The poor from Westchester County are just as poor as the poor from any other part of the country. And perhaps they are in a more difficult situation because they are living in one of the highest cost areas of the country. One out of every twelve families in Westchester County live below the national standard of abject poverty.

It was classic in Latin America where I did a good deal of work to deplore the situation of the very, very rich living side by side with the desperately poor and the great frustrations this situation produced in society. This is just as dramatically true in Westchester County. The poor people of Westchester certainly deserve to participate in this program in accordance with the costs that they have to pay for education.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I address myself to my friend from New York [Mr. GOODELL], because I thought I heard him say—and if I am wrong I am sure he will correct me—quote the distinguished majority leader as having said earlier that the committee bill is designed to equalize educational opportunities. Is that what the gentleman from New York said?

Mr. GOODELL. I believe he said equalize educational expenditures.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to respond?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman misunderstood me. I said, or at least intended to say, that if the purpose of this bill is to bring the disadvantaged child in every State up to the national average then we should have a general Federal-aid bill aimed at making the per capita expenditure for every child in the United States the same. I was merely pointing out that if the purpose was to equalize education it should not be limited to the disadvantaged child. I am sure that that is the gist of what I said.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman did not want to misstate what the majority leader had said.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say further that this formula has been examined in the subcommittee hearings and has had the approval of every leading educational association, of every State superintendent in the North and in the South who came before the committee. It has been examined from that viewpoint and it has stood that test. I suggest to my colleague from New York that he do not try to hack away at this bill and try to take $40 million from my State, because when he tours that State one of these days I am going to show him poverty that he has never seen anywhere else. New York needs this money just as much as does any other State in the Union for her disadvantaged children.

Mr. GOODSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWELL. Did not the gentleman from New York get permission just a few minutes ago to speak for 5 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. POWELL. I make the point of order, then, that he is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I was very much moved by the appeal from the gentleman representing Westchester County for the poor youngsters in that county. But as I look at this bill I feel that we are trying to set areas of priority, we are trying to help youngsters in the areas that have the greatest need and, doing so, I must immediately cross Westchester County off the list of those that should receive aid. Three percent of their children, 3 percent are in the category of coming from families with income less than $2,000. When you look through the list you will find Mississippi and Alabama and counties in other States in this country that go below that figure for 25 percent of their children, and up to 40 percent and 50 percent of their children who are in that category.

It seems to me that we should set some priorities here and put the money where it is most needed. This allocation formula in the bill does not do that.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, the basic premise, the argument of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and also the majority leader, as I understand is that this bill is not an equalization bill, not a general aid bill; but that it is a bill which limits its benefits to poor children.

Let us see if that is true. I would like the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] to follow my remarks, if he will, because I have some questions to direct to him. Suppose in a public school district that there are enough children of families with incomes of less than $2,000 so that the school qualifies for assistance under title I.

Suppose further that some of these children need remedial reading, and the school hires a teacher for remedial reading? Under this bill, will the children from families of less than $2,000 income be the only ones who could attend that class in remedial reading, or could all of the children who need the instruction attend that class in remedial reading?

Mr. PERKINS. All the children can attend that class in remedial reading under this proposed legislation. The grants are to be used by the local public educational agency to provide greater

educational opportunities in the public schools where there are concentrations of educationally deprived children.

Mr. GRIFFIN. All of the children who need remedial reading could attend the class, whether or not they come from families with incomes of less than $2,000; right?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct, under this legislation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Because lack of educational achievement naturally follows low income.

Mr. GRIFFIN. May I ask a further question; is it necessary that a child be from a family with less than $2,000 income to attend that class for remedial reading?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan, if the gentleman will answer my question.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I am a little bit surprised that the gentleman from Michigan——

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield if the gentleman is not going to answer my question.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I would like to answer the question if the gentleman will give me an opportunity.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is it necessary, under the bill, for any of the children to be from families of $2,000 per year income in order to attend this class in remedial reading?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I am surprised to hear the gentleman ask this question as a member of the committee. If the gentleman will read the section of the bill dealing with this subject, he will find the answer.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I know the answer to the question, but I think it should be on the RECORD and I am sorry that the gentleman did not answer it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan well knows that we do not put special hats or labels on any of these youngsters as to whether they come from families of low income, or whether they come from a higher income family, if they need that course in remedial reading and if they are attending a public school where there are concentrations of educationally deprived children, they can get the benefit.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The answer to the question is that the number of children of families with income of less than $2,000 is only a measurement of the aid that goes into the district, but it has nothing to do, necessarily, with the aid that goes to the children of that school?

Mr. PERKINS. No; the gentleman is wrong. The gentleman is absolutely wrong. In this regard the bill specifies:

SEC. 205. (a) A local educational agency may receive a basic grant or a special incentive grant under this title for any fiscal year only upon application therefor approved by the appropriate State educational agency, upon its determination (consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish)—

(1) that payments under this title will be used for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities) (A) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families and (B) which are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting those needs——

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Does the gentleman from Kentucky now contradict what he said in the committee and in the subcommittee, that we must not segregate the poor children and that we should construct schools and that we should have programs that would help the poor and not the rich families, but should have programs that will primarily help the poor children?

Mr. PERKINS. This bill is designed to help the educationally deprived children.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Are educationally deprived children the same as economically deprived children?

Mr. PERKINS. There is certainly a high correlation between low income and educational deprivation if they meet those standards.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If they meet what standards?

Mr. PERKINS. If large numbers of children from low income families attend a school all evidence points to the fact that you will find large numbers of educationally disadvantaged children in that school. The funds under this bill will be concentrated in those schools, as the distinguished gentleman knows.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I regret that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] objected to the request that I be allowed to speak for an additional 5 minutes. I sought to be assigned time during general debate as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] well knows. That request was denied by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Since early January 1965 I have been in close contact with the gentleman from Kentucky in an effort to help bring about a good education bill under the standards set out under the bill which he introduced early in the session, and I have assured the gentleman since early in January of my desire and intention to support legislation coming out of his subcommittee and his committee on this subject.

Under unanimous consent granted before the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole, I now place in the RECORD, first, a reprint from the Federal Register of Friday, December 4, 1964; second, instructions to school districts regarding compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; third, an HEW form, entitled "Explanation of Assurance of Compliance with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Regulation Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964"; fourth, HEW form 441, assurance of compliance; fifth, a reprint of an article which appeared in the Sunday edition of the Atlanta Constitution, dated March 7, 1965; sixth, a followup article which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution on the morning of March 8, 1965; seventh, a telegram addressed to me and to each Member from the Georgia delegation, signed by Mr. Jack Acree, executive secretary, Georgia School Board Association; eighth, a telegram addressed to me signed by Hon. J. C. Brown, chairman, Carroll County Board of Commissioners; ninth, a letter addressed to me signed by Dr. Quinton Prince, superintendent of schools of the Carroll County Board of Education, Carrollton, Ga.

(The matters referred to follow:)

[From the Federal Register, Dec. 4, 1964]

TITLE 45—PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Part 80—Nondiscrimination in Federally assisted programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—effectuation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

(New part 80 to subtitle A 45 CFR)

Sec.
80.1 Purpose.
80.2 Application of this part.
80.3 Discrimination prohibited.
80.4 Assurances required.
80.5 Illustrative applications.
80.6 Compliance information.
80.7 Conduct of investigations.
80.8 Procedure for effecting compliance.
80.9 Hearings.
80.10 Decision and notices.
80.11 Judicial review.
80.12 Effect on other regulations; forms and instructions.
80.13 Definitions.

Authority: The provisions of this part 80 are issued under section 602, 78 Stat. 252, and the laws referred to in appendix A.

§ 80.1 Purpose.

The purpose of this part is to effectuate the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (hereafter referred to as the "Act") to the end that no person in the United States shall; on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

§ 80.2 Application of this part.

This part applies to any program for which Federal financial assistance is authorized under a law administered by the Department, including the federally assisted programs and activities listed in appendix A of this part. It applies to money paid, property transferred, or other Federal financial assistance extended under any such program after the effective date of the regulation pursuant

to an application approved prior to such effective date. This part does not apply to (a) any Federal financial assistance by way of insurance or guaranty contracts, (b) money paid, property transferred, or other assistance extended under any such program before the effective date of this part, (c) any assistance to any individual who is the ultimate beneficiary under any such program, or (d) any employment practice, under any such program, of any employer, employment agency, or labor organization, except to the extent described in § 80.3. The fact that a program or activity is not listed in appendix A shall not mean, if title VI of the Act is otherwise applicable, that such program is not covered. Other programs under statutes now in force or hereinafter enacted may be added to this list by notice published in the Federal Register.

§ 80.3 Discrimination prohibited.

(a) *General.* No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program to which this part applies.

(b) *Specific discriminatory actions prohibited.* (1) A recipient under any program to which this part applies may not, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, on ground of race, color, or national origin:

(i) Deny an individual any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided under the program;

(ii) Provide any service, financial aid, or other benefit to an individual which is different, or is provided in a different manner, from that provided to others under the program;

(iii) Subject an individual to segregation or separate treatment in any matter related to his receipt of any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program;

(iv) Restrict an individual in any way in the enjoyment of any advantage or privilege enjoyed by others receiving any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program;

(v) Treat an individual differently from others in determining whether he satisfies any admission, enrollment, quota, eligibility, membership or other requirement or condition which individuals must meet in order to be provided any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided under the program;

(vi) Deny an individual an opportunity to participate in the program through the provision of services or otherwise or afford him an opportunity to do so which is different from that afforded others under the program (including the opportunity to participate in the program as an employee but only to the extent set forth in paragraph (c) of this section).

(2) A recipient, in determining the types of services, financial aid, or other benefits, or facilities which will be provided under any such program, or the class of individuals to whom, or the situations in which, such services, financial aid, other benefits, or facilities will be provided under any such program, or the class of individuals to be afforded an opportunity to participate in any such program, may not, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, utilize criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin, or have the effect of defeating or substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the program as respect individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin.

(3) As used in this section the services, financial aid, or other benefits provided under a program receiving Federal financial assistance shall be deemed to include any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided in or through a facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance.

(4) The enumeration of specific forms of prohibited discrimination in this paragraph and paragraph (c) of this section does not limit the generality of the prohibition in paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) *Employment practices.* Where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance to a program to which this part applies is to provide employment, a recipient may not (directly or through contractual or other arrangements) subject an individual to discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin in its employment practices under such program (including recruitment or recruitment advertising, employment, layoff or termination, upgrading, demotion, or transfer, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, and use of facilities), including programs where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is (i) to reduce the unemployment of such individuals or to help them through employment to meet subsistence needs, (ii) to assist such individuals through employment to meet expenses incident to the commencement or continuation of their education or training, (iii) to provide work experience which contributes to the education or training of such individuals, or (iv) to provide remunerative activity to such individuals who, because of severe handicaps cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market. The following programs under existing laws have one of the above objectives as a primary objective:

(*a*) Department projects under the Public Works Acceleration Act, Public Law 87–658.

(*b*) Community work and training programs under title IV of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 609.

(*c*) Work-study program under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, P.L. 88–210, sec. 13.

(*d*) Programs listed in appendix A as respects employment opportunities provided thereunder, or in facilities provided thereunder, which are limited, or for which preference is given, to students, fellows, or other persons in training for the same or related employments.

(*e*) Establishment of sheltered workshops under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 32–34.

The requirements applicable to construction employment under any such program shall be those specified in or pursuant to Executive Order 11114.

(d) *Indian Health and Cuban Refugee programs.* An individual shall not be deemed subjected to discrimination by reason of his exclusion from the benefits of a program limited by Federal law to individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin different from his.

(e) *Medical emergencies.* Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, a recipient of Federal financial assistance shall not be deemed to have failed to comply with paragraph (a) of this section if immediate provision of a service or other benefit to an individual is necessary to prevent his death or serious impairment of his health, and such service or other benefit cannot be provided except by or through a medical institution which refuses or fails to comply with paragraph (a) of this section.

§ 80.4 Assurances required.

(a) *General.* (1) Every application for Federal financial assistance to carry out a program to which this part applies, except a program to which paragraph (b) of this section applies, and every application for Federal financial assistance to provide a facility shall, as a condition to its approval and the extension of any Federal financial assistance pursuant to the application, contain or be accompanied by an assurance that the program will be conducted or the facility operated in compliance with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part. In the case of an application for Federal financial assistance to provide real property or structures thereon, the assurance shall obligate the recipient, or, in the case of a subsequent transfer, the transferee, for the period during which the real property or structures are used for a purpose for which the Federal financial assistance is extended or for another purpose involving the provision of similar services or benefits. In the case of personal property the assurance shall obligate the recipient for the period during which he retains ownership or possession of the property. In all other cases the assurance shall obligate the recipient for the period during which Federal financial assistance is extended pursuant to the application. The responsible Department official shall specify the form of the foregoing assurances for each program, and the extent to which like assurances will be required of subgrantees, contractors and subcontractors, transferees, successors in interest, and other participants in the program. Any such assurance shall include provisions which give the United States a right to seek its judicial enforcement.

(2) The assurance required in the case of a transfer of surplus real property shall be inserted in the instrument effecting the transfer of any such surplus land, together with any improvements located thereon, and shall consist of (i) a condition coupled with a right to be reserved to the Department to revert title to the property in the event of breach of such nondiscrimination condition during the period during which the real property is used for a purpose for which the Federal financial assistance is extended or for another purpose involving the provision of similar services or benefits, and (ii) a covenant running with the land for the same period. In the event a transferee of surplus real property proposes to mortgage or otherwise encumber the real property as security for financing construction of new, or improvement of existing, facilities on such property for the purposes for which the property was transferred, the Secretary may agree, upon request of the transferee and if necessary to accomplish such financing, and upon such conditions as he deems appropriate, to forbear the exercise of such right to revert title for so long as the lien of such mortgage or other encumbrance remains effective.

(b) *Continuing State programs.* Every application by a State or a State agency to carry out a program involving continuing Federal financial assistance to which this part applies (including the programs listed in part 2 of appendix A) shall as a condition to its approval and the extension of any Federal financial assistance pursuant to the application (1) contain or be accompanied by a statement that the program is (or, in the case of a new program, will be) conducted in compliance with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part, or a statement of the extent to which it is not, at the time the statement is made, so conducted, and (2) provide or be accompanied by provision for such methods of administration for the program as are found by the responsible Department official to give reasonable assurance that the applicant and all recipients of Federal financial assistance under such program will comply with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part, including methods of administration which give reasonable assurance that any noncompliance indicated in the statement under subparagraph (1) of this paragraph will be corrected.

(c) *Elementary and secondary schools.* The requirements of paragraph (a) or (b) of this section with respect to any elementary or secondary school or school system shall be deemed to be satisfied if such school or school system (1) is subject to a final order of a

court of the United States for the desegregation of such school or school system, and provides an assurance that it will comply with such order, including any future modification of such order, or (2) submits a plan for the desegregation of such school or school system which the Commissioner of Education determines is adequate to accomplish the purposes of the Act and this part, and provides reasonable assurance that it will carry out such plan; in any case of continuing Federal financial assistance the Commissioner may reserve the right to redetermine, after such period as may be specified by him, the adequacy of the plan to accomplish the purposes of the Act and this part. In any case in which a final order of a court of the United States for the desegregation of such school or school system is entered after submission of such a plan, such plan shall be revised to conform to such final order, including any future modification of such order.

(d) *Assurances from institutions.* (1) In the case of any application for Federal financial assistance to an institution of higher education (including assistance for construction, for research, for a special training project, for a student loan program, or for any other purpose), the assurance required by this section shall extend to admission practices and to all other practices relating to the treatment of students.

(2) The assurance required with respect to an institution of higher education, hospital, or any other institution, insofar as the assurance relates to the institution's practices with respect to admission or other treatment of individuals as students, patients, or clients of the institution or to the opportunity to participate in the provision of services or other benefits to such individuals, shall be applicable to the entire institution unless the applicant establishes, to the satisfaction of the responsible Department official, that the institution's practices in designated parts or programs of the institution will in no way affect its practices in the program of the institution for which Federal financial assistance is sought, or the beneficiaries of or participants in such program. If in any such case the assistance sought is for the construction of a facility or part of a facility, the assurance shall in any event extend to the entire facility and to facilities operated in connection therewith.

§ 80.5 Illustrative applications.

The following examples will illustrate the application of the foregoing provisions to some of the major programs of the Department. (In all cases the discrimination prohibited is discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin prohibited by title VI of the Act and this part, as a condition of the receipt of Federal financial assistance.)

(a) In grant programs which support the provision of health or welfare services, discrimination in the selection or eligibility of individuals to receive the services, and segregation or other discriminatory practices in the manner of providing them, are prohibited. This prohibition extends to all facilities and services provided by the grantee under the program or, if the grantee is a State, by a political subdivision of the State. It extends also to services purchased or otherwise obtained by the grantee (or political subdivision) from hospitals, nursing homes, schools, and similar institutions for beneficiaries of the program, and to the facilities in which such services are provided, subject, however, to the provisions of § 80.3(e).

(b) In the federally affected area programs (P.L. 815 and P.L. 874) for construction aid and for general support of the operation of elementary or secondary schools, or in programs for more limited support to such schools such as for the acquisition of equipment, the provision of vocational education, or the provision of guidance and counseling services, discrimination by the recipient school district in any of its elementary or secondary schools in the admission of students, or in the treatment of its students in any aspect of the educational process, is prohibited. In this and the following illustrations the prohibition of discrimination in the treatment of students or other trainees includes the prohibition of discrimination among the students or trainees in the availability or use of any academic, dormitory, eating, recreational, or other facilities of the grantee or other recipient.

(c) In a research, training, demonstration, or other grant to a university for activities to be conducted in a graduate school, discrimination in the admission and treatment of students in the graduate school is prohibited, and the prohibition extends to the entire university unless it satisfies the responsible Department official that practices with respect to other parts or programs of the university will not interfere, directly or indirectly, with fulfillment of the assurance required with respect to the graduate school.

(d) In a training grant to a hospital or other nonacademic institution, discrimination is prohibited in the selection of individuals to be trained and in their treatment by the grantee during their training. In a research or demonstration grant to such an institution discrimination is prohibited with respect to any educational activity and any provision of medical or other services and any financial aid to individuals incident to the program.

(e) In grant programs to assist in the construction of facilities for the provision of health, education, or welfare services assurances will be required that services will be provided without discrimination, to the same extent that discrimination would be prohibited as a condition of Federal operating grants for the support of such service. Thus, as a condition of grants for the construction of academic, research, or other facilities at institutions of higher education, assurances will be required that there will be no discrimination in the admission or treatment of students. In the case of hospital construction grants the assurance will apply to patients, to interns, residents, student nurses, and other trainees, and to the privilege of physicians, dentists, and other professionally qualified persons to practice in the hospital, and will apply to the entire facility for which, or for a part of which the grant is made, and to facilities operated in connection therewith. In other construction grants the assurances required will similarly be adapted to the nature of the activities to be conducted in the facilities for construction of which the grants have been authorized by Congress.

(f) Upon transfers of real or personal surplus property for health or educational uses, discrimination is prohibited to the same extent as in the case of grants for the construction of facilities or the provision of equipment for like purposes.

(g) Each applicant for a grant for the construction of educational television facilities is required to provide an assurance that it will, in its broadcast services, give due consideration to the interests of all significant racial or ethnic groups within the population to be served by the applicant.

(h) A recipient may not take action that is calculated to bring about indirectly what this part forbids it to accomplish directly. Thus a State, in selecting or approving projects or sites for the construction of public libraries which will receive Federal financial assistance, may not base its selections or approvals on criteria which have the effect of defeating or of substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the Federal assistance program as respects individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin.

§ 80.6 Compliance information.

(a) *Cooperation and assistance.* Each responsible Department official shall to the fullest extent practicable seek the cooperation of recipients in obtaining compliance with this part and shall provide assistance and guidance to recipients to help them comply voluntarily with this part.

(b) *Compliance reports.* Each recipient shall keep such records and submit to the responsible Department official or his designee timely, complete and accurate compliance reports at such times, and in such form and containing such information, as the responsible Department official or his designee may determine to be necessary to enable him to ascertain whether the recipient has complied or is complying with this part. In the case of any program under which a primary recipient extends Federal financial assistance to any other recipient, such other recipient shall also submit such compliance reports to the primary recipient as may be necessary to enable the primary recipient to carry out its obligations under this part.

(c) *Access to sources of information.* Each recipient shall permit access by the responsible Department official or his designee during normal business hours to such of its books, records, accounts, and other sources of information, and its facilities as may be pertinent to ascertain compliance with this part. Where any information required of a recipient is in the exclusive possession of any other agency, institution or person and this agency, institution or person shall fail or refuse to furnish this information, the recipient shall so certify in its report and shall set forth what efforts it has made to obtain the information.

(d) *Information to beneficiaries and participants.* Each recipient shall make available to participants, beneficiaries, and other interested persons such information regarding the provisions of this part and its applicability to the program under which the recipient receives Federal financial assistance, and make such information available to them in such manner, as the responsible Department official finds necessary to apprise such persons of the protections against discrimination assured them by the Act and this part.

§ 80.7 Conduct of investigations.

(a) *Periodic compliance reviews.* The responsible Department official or his designee shall from time to time review the practices of recipients to determine whether they are complying with this part.

(b) *Complaints.* Any person who believes himself or any specific class of individuals to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by this part may by himself or by a representative file with the responsible Department official or his designee a written complaint. A complaint must be filed not later than 90 days from the date of the alleged discrimination, unless the time for filing is extended by the responsible Department official or his designee.

(c) *Investigations.* The responsible Department official or his designee will make a prompt investigation whenever a compliance review, report, complaint, or any other information indicates a possible failure to comply with this part. The investigation should include, where appropriate, a review of the pertinent practices and policies of the recipient, the circumstances under which the possible noncompliance with this part occurred, and other factors relevant to a determination as to whether the recipient has failed to comply with this part.

(d) *Resolution of matters.* (1) If an investigation pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section indicates a failure to comply with this part, the responsible Department official or his designee will so inform the recipient and the matter will be resolved by informal means whenever possible. If it has been determined that the matter cannot be resolved by in-

formal means, action will be taken as provided for in § 80.8.

(2) If an investigation does not warrant action pursuant to subparagraph (1) of this paragraph the responsible Department official or his designee will so inform the recipient and the complainant, if any, in writing.

(e) *Intimidatory or retaliatory acts prohibited.* No recipient or other person shall intimidate, threaten, coerce, or discriminate against any individual for the purpose of interfering with any right or privilege secured by section 601 of the Act or this part, or because he has made a complaint, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this part. The identity of complainants shall be kept confidential except to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of this part, including the conduct of any investigation, hearing, or judicial proceeding arising thereunder.

§ 80.8 Procedure for effecting compliance.

(a) *General.* If there appears to be a failure or threatened failure to comply with this regulation, and if the noncompliance or threatened noncompliance cannot be corrected by informal means, compliance with this part may be effected by the suspension or termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance or by any other means authorized by law. Such other means may include, but are not limited to, (1) a reference to the Department of Justice with a recommendation that appropriate proceedings be brought to enforce any rights of the United States under any law of the United States (including other titles of the Act), or any assurance or other contractual undertaking, and (2) any applicable proceeding under State or local law.

(b) *Noncompliance with § 80.4.* If an applicant fails or refuses to furnish an assurance required under § 80.4 or otherwise fails or refuses to comply with a requirement imposed by or pursuant to that section Federal financial assistance may be refused in accordance with the procedures of paragraph (c) of this section. The Department shall not be required to provide assistance in such a case during the pendency of the administrative proceedings under such paragraph except that the Department shall continue assistance during the pendency of such proceedings where such assistance is due and payable pursuant to an application therefor approved prior to the effective date of this part.

(c) *Termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance.* No order suspending, terminating or refusing to grant or continue Federal financial assistance shall become effective until (1) the responsible Department official has advised the applicant or recipient of his failure to comply and has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, (2) there has been an express finding on the record, after opportunity for hearing, of a failure by the applicant or recipient to comply with a requirement imposed by or pursuant to this part, (3) the action has been approved by the Secretary pursuant to § 80.10(e), and (4) the expiration of 30 days after the Secretary has filed with the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the program involved, a full written report of the circumstances and the grounds for such action. Any action to suspend or terminate or to refuse to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance shall be limited to the particular political entity, or part thereof, or other applicant or recipient as to whom such a finding has been made and shall be limited in its effect to the particular program, or part thereof, in which such noncompliance has been so found.

(d) *Other means authorized by law.* No action to effect compliance by any other means authorized by law shall be taken until (1) the responsible Department official has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, (2) the action has been approved by the Secretary, (3) the recipient or other person has been notified of its failure to comply and of the action to be taken to effect compliance, and (4) the expiration of at least 10 days from the mailing of such notice to the recipient or other person. During this period of at least 10 days additional efforts shall be made to persuade the recipient or other person to comply with the regulation and to take such corrective action as may be appropriate.

§ 80.9 Hearings.

(a) *Opportunity for hearing.* Whenever an opportunity for a hearing is required by § 80.8(c), reasonable notice shall be given by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, to the affected applicant or recipient. This notice shall advise the applicant or recipient of the action proposed to be taken, the specific provision under which the proposed action against it is to be taken, and the matters of fact or law asserted as the basis for this action, and either (1) fix a date not less than 20 days after the date of such notice within which the applicant or recipient may request of the responsible Department official that the matter be scheduled for hearing or (2) advise the applicant or recipient that the matter in question has been set down for hearing at a stated place and time. The time and place so fixed shall be reasonable and shall be subject to change for cause. The complainant, if any, shall be advised of the time and place of the hearing. An applicant or recipient may waive a hearing and submit written information and argument for the record. The failure of an applicant or recipient to request a hearing under this paragraph or to appear at a hearing for which a date has been set shall be deemed to be a waiver of the right to a hearing under section 602 of the Act and § 80.8(c) of this part and consent to the making of a decision on the basis of such information as is available.

(b) *Time and place of hearing.* Hearings shall be held at the offices of the Department in Washington, D.C., at a time fixed by the responsible Department official unless he determines that the convenience of the applicant or recipient or of the Department requires that another place be selected. Hearings shall be held before the responsible Department official or, at his discretion, before a hearing examiner designated in accordance with section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(c) *Right to counsel.* In all proceedings under this section, the applicant or recipient and the Department shall have the right to be represented by counsel.

(d) *Procedures, evidence, and record.* (1) The hearing, decision, and any administrative review thereof shall be conducted in conformity with sections 5–8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, and in accordance with such rules of procedure as are proper (and not inconsistent with this section) relating to the conduct of the hearing, giving of notices subsequent to those provided for in paragraph (a) of this section, taking of testimony, exhibits, arguments and briefs, requests for findings, and other related matters. Both the Department and the applicant or recipient shall be entitled to introduce all relevant evidence on the issues as stated in the notice for hearing or as determined by the officer conducting the hearing at the outset of or during the hearing.

(2) Technical rules of evidence shall not apply to hearings conducted pursuant to this part, but rules or principles designed to assure production of the most credible evidence available and to subject testimony to test by cross-examination shall be applied where reasonably necessary by the officer conducting the hearing. The hearing officer may exclude irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence. All documents and other evidence offered or taken for the record shall be open to examination by the parties and opportunity shall be given to refute facts and arguments advanced on either side of the issues. A transcript shall be made of the oral evidence except to the extent the substance thereof is stipulated for the record. All decisions shall be based upon the hearing record and written findings shall be made.

(e) *Consolidated or Joint Hearings.* In cases in which the same or related facts are asserted to constitute noncompliance with this regulation with respect to two or more programs to which this part applies, or noncompliance with this part and the regulations of one or more other Federal departments or agencies issued under Title VI of the Act, the Secretary may, by agreement with such other departments or agencies where applicable, provide for the conduct of consolidated or joint hearings, and for the application to such hearings of rules of procedures not inconsistent with this part. Final decisions in such cases, insofar as this regulation is concerned, shall be made in accordance with § 80.10.

§ 80.10 Decisions and notices.

(a) *Decision by person other than the responsible Department official.* If the hearing is held by a hearing examiner such hearing examiner shall either make an initial decision, if so authorized, or certify the entire record including his recommended findings and proposed decision to the responsible Department official for a final decision, and a copy of such initial decision or certification shall be mailed to the applicant or recipient. Where the initial decision is made by the hearing examiner the applicant or recipient may within 30 days of the mailing of such notice of initial decision file with the responsible Department official his exceptions to the initial decision, with his reasons therefor. In the absence of exceptions, the responsible Department official may on his own motion within 45 days after the initial decision serve on the applicant or recipient a notice that he will review the decision. Upon the filing of such exceptions or of such notice of review the responsible Department official shall review the initial decision and issue his own decision thereon including the reasons therefor. In the absence of either exceptions or a notice of review the initial decision shall constitute the final decision of the responsible Department official.

(b) *Decisions on record or review by the responsible Department official.* Whenever a record is certified to the responsible Department official for decision or he reviews the decision of a hearing examiner pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, or whenever the responsible Department official conducts the hearing, the applicant or recipient shall be given reasonable opportunity to file with him briefs or other written statements of its contentions, and a copy of the final decision of the responsible Department official shall be given in writing to the applicant or recipient and to the complainant, if any.

(c) *Decisions on record where a hearing is waived.* Whenever a hearing is waived pursuant to § 80.9(a) a decision shall be made by the responsible departmental official on the record and a copy of such decision shall be given in writing to the applicant or recipient, and to the complainant, if any.

(d) *Rulings required.* Each decision of a hearing officer or responsible Department official shall set forth his ruling on each finding, conclusion, or exception presented, and shall identify the requirement or requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part with which it is found that the applicant or recipient has failed to comply.

(e) *Approval by Secretary.* Any final decision of a responsible Department official (other than the Secretary) which provides

for the suspension or termination of, or the refusal to grant or continue Federal financial assistance, or the imposition of any other sanction available under this part of the Act, shall promptly be transmitted to the Secretary, who may approve such decision, may vacate it, or remit or mitigate any sanction imposed.

(f) *Content of orders.* The final decision may provide for suspension or termination of, or refusal to grant or continue Federal financial assistance, in whole or in part, under the program involved, and may contain such terms, conditions, and other provisions as are consistent with and will effectuate the purposes of the Act and this part, including provisions designed to assure that no Federal financial assistance will thereafter be extended under such program to the applicant or recipient determined by such decision to be in default in its performance of an assurance given by it pursuant to this part, or to have otherwise failed to comply with this part, unless and until it corrects its noncompliance and satisfies the responsible Department official that it will fully comply with this part.

§ 80.11 Judicial review.

Action taken pursuant to section 602 of the Act is subject to judicial review as provided in section 603 of the Act.

§ 80.12 Effect on other regulations; forms and instructions.

(a) *Effect on other regulations.* All regulations, orders, or like directions heretofore issued by any officer of the Department which impose requirements designed to prohibit any discrimination against individuals on the ground of race, color, or national origin under any program to which this part applies, and which authorize the suspension or termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance to any applicant for or recipient of such assistance under such program for failure to comply with such requirements, are hereby superseded to the extend that such discrimination is prohibited by this part, except that nothing in this part shall be deemed to relieve any person of any obligation assumed or imposed under any such superseded regulation, order, instruction, or like direction prior to the effective date of this part. Nothing in this part, however, shall be deemed to supersede any of the following (including future amendments thereof): (1) Executive Orders 10925 and 11114 and regulations issued thereunder, (2) the "Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration," issued jointly by the Secretaries of Defense, of Health, Education, and Welfare, and of Labor, 28 F.R. 734, or (3) Executive Order 11063 and regulations issued thereunder, or any other regulations or instructions, insofar as such Order, regulations, or instructions prohibit discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin in any program or situation to which this part is inapplicable, or prohibit discrimination on any other ground.

(b) *Forms and instructions.* Each responsible Department official shall issue and promptly make available to interested persons forms and detailed instructions and procedures for effectuating this part as applied to programs to which this part applies and for which he is responsible.

(c) *Supervision and coordination.* The Secretary may from time to time assign to officials of the Department, or to officials of other departments or agencies of the Government with the consent of such departments or agencies, responsibilities in connection with the effectuation of the purposes of title VI of the Act and this part (other than responsibility for final decision as provided in § 80.10), including the achievement of effective coordination and maximum uniformity within the Department and within the Executive Branch of the Government in the application of title VI and this part to similar programs and in similar situations.

§ 80.13 Definitions.

As used in this part—

(a) The term "Department" means the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and includes each of its operating agencies and other organizational units.

(b) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(c) The term "responsible Department official" with respect to any program receiving Federal financial assistance means the Secretary or other official of the Department who by law or by delegation has the principal responsibility within the Department for the administration of the law extending such assistance.

(d) The term "United States" means the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, the Canal Zone, and the territories and possessions of the United States, and the term "State" means any one of the foregoing.

(e) The term "Federal financial assistance" includes (1) grants and loans of Federal funds, (2) the grant or donation of Federal property and interests in property, (3) the detail of Federal personnel, (4) the sale and lease of, and the permission to use (on other than a casual or transient basis), Federal property or any interest in such property without consideration or at a nominal consideration, or at a consideration which is reduced for the purpose of assisting the recipient, or in recognition of the public interest to be served by such sale or lease to the recipient, and (5) any Federal agreement, arrangement, or other contract which has as one of its purposes the provision of assistance.

(f) The term "program" includes any program, project, or activity for the provision of services, financial aid, or other benefits to individuals (including education or training, health, welfare, rehabilitation, housing, or other services, whether provided through employees of the recipient of Federal financial assistance or provided by others through contracts or other arrangements with the recipient, and including work opportunities and cash or loan or other assistance to individuals), or for the provision of facilities for furnishing services, financial aid or other benefits to individuals. The services, financial aid, or other benefits provided under a program receiving Federal financial assistance shall be deemed to include any services, financial aid, or other benefits provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance or with the aid of any non-Federal funds, property, or other resources required to be expended or made available for the program to meet matching requirements or other conditions which must be met in order to receive the Federal financial assistance, and to include any services, financial aid, or other benefits provided in or through a facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance or such non-Federal resources.

(g) The term "facility" includes all or any portion of structures, equipment, or other real or personal property or interests therein, and the provision of facilities includes the construction, expansion, renovation, remodeling, alteration or acquisition of facilities.

(h) The term "recipient" means any State, political subdivision of any State, or instrumentality of any State or political subdivision, any public or private agency, institution, or organization, or other entity, or any individual, in any State, to whom Federal financial assistance is extended, directly or through another recipient, for any program, including any successor, assign, or transferee thereof, but such term does not include any ultimate beneficiary under any such program.

(i) The term "primary recipient" means any recipient which is authorized or required to extend Federal financial assistance to another recipient for the purpose of carrying out a program.

(j) The term "applicant" means one who submits an application, request, or plan required to be approved by a responsible Department official, or by a primary recipient, as a condition to eligibility for Federal financial assistance, and the term "application" means such an application, request, or plan.

Effective date. This part shall become effective on the 30th day following the date of its publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Dated: November 27, 1964.

[SEAL] ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Approved: December 3, 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAMS TO WHICH THIS PART APPLIES

Part 1. Programs other than State-administered continuing programs.

1. Experimental hospital facilities (sec. 624, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 291n).

2. Health research facilities (title VII, part A, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 292–292j).

3. Teaching facilities for medical, dental, and other health personnel (title VII, part B, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 293–293h; secs. 801–804, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 296, 296a–c).

4. Mental retardation research facilities (title VII, part D, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 295–295e).

5. University affiliated mental retardation facilities (part B, Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act, 42 U.S.C. 2661–2665).

6. Heart disease laboratories and related facilities for patient care (sec. 412(d), Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 287a(d)).

7. Municipal sewage treatment works (sec. 6, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466e).

8. Loans for acquisition of science, mathematics, and foreign language equipment (title III, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 445).

9. Construction of facilities for institutions of higher education (Higher Education Facilities Act, 20 U.S.C. 701–757).

10. School construction in Federally-affected areas (20 U.S.C. 631–645).

11. Educational television broadcasting facilities (47 U.S.C. 390–397).

12. Surplus real and related personal property disposal (40 U.S.C. 484(k)).

13. George Washington University Hospital construction (76 Stat. 83, P.L. 87–460, May 31, 1962).

14. Loan service of captioned films for the deaf (42 U.S.C. 2491–2494).

15. Residential vocational education schools (20 U.S.C. 35*l*).

16. Department projects under the Public Works Acceleration Act (P.L. 87–658).

17. Research projects, including conferences, communication actlvities and primate or other center grants (secs. 301, 303, 308, 624, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 241, 242a, 242f, 291n; sec. 4, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466c; sec. 3, Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857b).

18. General research support (sec. 301(d), Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 241).

19. Community health studies and demonstrations (sec. 316, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 247a).

20. Mental health demonstrations and administrative studies (sec. 303(a)(2), Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 242a).

21. Migratory workers health services (sec. 310, Public Health Service Act, 76 Stat. 592, P.L. 87–692, Sept. 25, 1962).

22. Intensive vaccination projects (sec. 317, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 247b).

23. Tuberculosis and venereal disease control projects (current appropriation Act, P.L. 88–605).

24. Air pollution demonstration and survey projects and control programs (secs. 3 and 4, Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857b, 1857c).

25. Water pollution demonstration grants (sec. 4(a)(2), Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466c).

26. Health research training projects and fellowship grants (secs. 301, 433, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 241, 289c).

27. Categorical (heart, cancer, air pollution, etc.) grants for training, traineeships or fellowships (secs. 303, 433, etc., Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 242a, 289c, etc.; sec. 3, Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857b; sec. 4, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466c).

28. Advanced professional nurse traineeships, improvement in nurse training and partial reimbursement to diploma schools of nursing (secs. 805, 806, 821, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 296d, 296e, 297).

29. Grants to institutions for traineeships for professional public health personnel (sec. 306, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 242d).

30. Grants to schools for specialized training in public health (sec. 309, Public Health Service Act, 242g).

31. Grants for special vocational rehabilitation projects (sec. 4, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 34).

32. Experimental, pilot or demonstration projects to promote the objectives of title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act (sec. 1115, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1315).

33. Social security and welfare cooperative research or demonstration projects (sec. 1110, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1310).

34. Child welfare research, training or demonstration projects (sec. 526, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 726).

35. Research projects relating to maternal and child health services and crippled children's services (sec. 532, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 729a).

36. Maternal and child health special project grants to institutions of higher learning (sec. 502(b), Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 702(b)).

37. Maternity and infant care special project grants to local health agencies (sec. 531, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 726).

38. Special project grants to institutions of higher learning for crippled children's services (sec. 512(b), Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 712(b)).

39. Demonstration and evaluation projects and training of personnel in the field of juvenile delinquency (Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 (42 U.S.C. 2541, et seq.)).

40. Cooperative educational research (20 U.S.C. 331–332).

41. Language research (title VI, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 512).

42. Research in new educational media (title VII, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 541–542).

43. Research, training, and demonstration projects under Vocational Education Act of 1963 (sec. 4(c), 20 U.S.C. 35c(c)).

44. Grants for research and demonstration projects in education of handicapped children (20 U.S.C. 618).

45. Training grants for welfare personnel (sec. 705, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 906).

46. Allowances to institutions training graduate fellows or other trainees (title IV, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 461–465; sec. 4, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 34; secs. 301, 433, etc., Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 241, 289(c), etc.; sec. 3, Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857b; sec. 4, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466c).

47. Grants for teaching and the training of teachers for the education of handicapped children (20 U.S.C. 611–617).

48. Training persons in the use of films for the deaf (42 U.S.C. 2493(b)(4)).

49. Training for teachers of the deaf (20 U.S.C. 671–676).

50. Research in the use of educational and training films for the deaf (42 U.S.C. 2493(a)).

51. Operation and maintenance of schools in federally affected areas (20 U.S.C. 236–244).

52. Grants for teacher training and employment of specialists in desegregation problems (sec. 405, Civil Rights Act of 1964, P.L. 88–352).

53. Issuance to agencies or organizations of rent-free permits for operation, on Federal property in the custody of the Department, of vending stands for the blind, credit unions, Federal employee associations, etc. (Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act, 20 U.S.C. 107–107f; 45 CFR Part 20; sec. 25, Federal Credit Union Act, 12 U.S.C. 1770; etc.)

54. Higher education student loan program (title II, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 421–429).

55. Health professions school student loan program (title VII, Part C, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 294; secs. 822–828, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 297 a-g).

56. Land-grant college aid (7 U.S.C. 301–329).

57. Language and area centers (title VI, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 511–513).

58. American Printing House for the Blind (20 U.S.C. 101–105).

59. Future Farmers of America (36 U.S.C. 271–291) and similar programs.

60. Science Clubs (20 U.S.C. 2 (note)).

61. Howard University (20 U.S.C. 121–131).

62. Gallaudet College (31 D.C. Code, Ch. 10).

63. Hawaii leprosy payments (sec. 331, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 255).

64. Grants to schools of public health for provision of comprehensive training and specialized services and assistance (sec. 314(c), Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 246(c)).

65. Grants to agencies and organizations under Cuban Refugee program (22 U.S.C. 2601(b)(4)).

66. Grants for construction of hospitals serving Indians (P.L. 85–151, 42 U.S.C. 2005).

67. Indian Sanitation Facilities (P.L. 86–121, 42 U.S.C. 2004a).

68. Areawide planning of health facilities (sec. 318, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 247c).

69. Training institutes under sec. 511 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended (20 U.S.C. 491) and under title XI of such Act as added by P.L. 88–665 (20 U.S.C. 591-592).

Part 2. State-administered continuing programs.

1. Grants to States for control of venereal disease, tuberculosis, and for public health services (heart, cancer, mental health, radiological health, etc.) (sec. 314, Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 246), and current appropriation act).

2. Grants to States for water pollution control (sec. 5, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466d).

3. Grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services (sec. 2, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 32).

4. Grants to States for projects to extend and improve vocational rehabilitation services (sec. 3, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 33).

5. Designation of State licensing agency for blind operators of vending stands (Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act, 20 U.S.C. [redacted]).

6. Grants to States for old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged (title I, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 301–306).

7. Grants to States for aid and services to needy families with children (title IV, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 601–609).

8. Grants to States for aid to the blind (title X, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1201–1206).

9. Grants to States for aid to the permanently and totally disabled (title XIV, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1351–1355).

10. Grants to States for aid to the aged, blind or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged (title XVI, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1381–1385).

11. Grants to States for maternal and child health services (title V, part 1, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 701–705).

12. Grants to States for services for crippled children (title V, part 2, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 711–715).

13. Grants to States for special projects for maternity and infant care (sec. 531, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 729).

14. Grants to States for child welfare services (title V, part 3, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 721–725, 727, 728).

15. Grants to States for public library services and construction (20 U.S.C. sec. 351–358; P.L. 88–269).

16. Grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction (title III, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 441–444).

17. Grants to States for guidance, counseling and testing of students (title V–A, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 481–484).

18. Grants to States for educational statistics services (sec. 1009, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 589).

19. Surplus personal property disposal donations for health and educational purposes through State agencies (40 U.S.C. 484(j)).

20. Grants to States for hospital and medical facilities (title VI, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 291–291z).

21. Grants to States for community mental health centers construction (Community Mental Health Centers Act, 42 U.S.C. 2681–2688).

22. Grants to States for vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act, 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28; George-Barden Act, 20 U.S.C. 15i–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg; Supplementary Acts, 20 U.S.C. 30–34.

23. Grants to States for mental retardation facilities (Part C, Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act, 42 U.S.C. 2671–2677).

24. Arrangements with State vocational education agencies for training under the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2513(c), 2601, 2602).

25. Grants to States for comprehensive planning for mental retardation (title XVII, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1391–1394).

[F.R. Doc. 64–12539; Filed, Dec. 3, 1964; 4:23 p.m.]

INSTRUCTIONS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT [redacted]: NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

I. NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides that: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Title VI also directs each Federal agency to adopt regulations to carry out the provisions of section 601. A regulation pursuant to title VI has been issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and approved by the President effective

January 3, 1965. (Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, pt. 80.)

The following instructions are intended to aid local school districts and other agencies participating in federally assisted programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in fulfilling the requirements of title VI and the regulation. Particular attention is directed to section VI of these instructions: Procedure for Submitting Assurances.

II. ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE

For a school district or other agency to be eligible for Federal financial assistance under any program administered through the U.S. Office of Education the official governing body of the school district or other agency is required under section 80.4 of the regulation to furnish an assurance of compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act. A standard assurance of compliance, Form HEW–441, is provided for any school district or other agency prepared at the time of submitting the assurance to comply fully with the requirement of nondiscrimination stated in section 601 of the act. The filing of this standard assurance form, which is applicable to all schools operated by the school district, satisfies the assurance requirement for all programs of Federal financial assistance administered by the Office of Education. Once the standard assurance of compliance has been filed each future application or reapplication for Federal financial assistance need only contain or be accompanied by the following statement by an authorized official of the applicant:

The assurance of compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act dated _____ (Month, day, year) applies to the application submitted herewith.

Programs of Federal financial assistances administered through the Office of Education to which the assurance of compliance would be applicable, include:

National Defense Education Act, title III (acquisition of equipment for science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign languages, English, and reading instruction).

National Defense Education Act, title V (guidance, counseling, and testing).

Vocational and technical education programs; Smith-Hughes, George-Barden, and Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Manpower Development and Training Act.

Area Redevelopment Act (training under sec. 16).

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (operation and maintenance under Public Law 874 and school construction under Public Law 815).

Library Services and Construction Act.

Adult basic education program; title II–B of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Educational Improvement for Handicapped Children and Youth.

III. SCHOOL DISTRICTS UNDER COURT ORDER OR PLAN OF DESEGRATION

A school district not yet fully desegregated or otherwise not in a position to give an assurance of full compliance with section 601 of the act should not execute form No. HEW 441. Such a school district may, however, apply for Federal financial assistance if it can comply with the requirements of 80.4(c) of the regulation, regarding court orders and plans for desegregation.

A school district or agency which elects to apply under section 80.4(c)(1) of the regulation should submit a copy of the final court order together with a report of the present state of compliance with that order and its program for continued compliance.

A school district or agency which elects to apply under section 80.4(c)(2) of the regulation should submit a plan which must meet the following conditions as a minimum:

1. Attendance areas. No plan contemplating the use of attendance areas for desegregated grades will be satisfactory unless such areas are bounded by rational and reasonable lines and are part of a system of unitary, nonracial zones.

2. Initial assignment, transfer, and reassignment. All provisions in a plan for initial assignment, transfer, or reassignment to schools (and within a school) must, for desegregated grades, operate without regard to the race, color, or national origin of any individual.

3. Plans based on freedom of choice. Insofar as desegregation plans based on concepts of freedom of choice make use of any restrictions upon choice (for example, policies governing cases of overcrowding), all such restrictions must operate without regard to the race, color, or national origin of any individual.

4. Timing; special educational problems incident to desegregation. Each plan must specify the steps (and fix a time schedule applicable to each step) to be taken toward operation of the schools in accordance with the policy of nondiscrimination stated in section 601 of the act and the regulation. In any event, the plan must provide for a substantial good faith start by the beginning of the school year next following submission of the plan. In addition, the plan must provide a schedule of appropriate preparatory steps to prepare the staff and community for desegregation. Such preparatory steps must begin immediately upon adoption of the plan. Any steps taken prior to adoption of the plan should also be reported.

5. Public notice. No plan will be satisfactory unless it contains specific assurance that ample notice will be given to pupils, parents, and the general public of rules and regulations respecting assignments, transfer, reassignments, and of other provisions of the plan. Such notice shall be given suitably in advance of the time at which individual choice or action must be taken.

In the case of a school district submitting a plan of desegregation, the burden rests with the school district to establish that the time prescribed in the plan for its implementation is necessary in the public interest and is consistent with good faith compliance at the earliest practicable date.

The Commissioner reserves the right to reevaluate a plan periodically to determine its adequacy to accomplish the purposes of the act and the regulation.

Such plans are not in any way binding on parties to litigation involving questions of discrimination in the policies or practices of the district.

IV. EFFECT OF SUBMISSION OF ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE IN STATE-ADMINISTERED PROGRAMS

Effective as of January 3, 1965, the effective date of the regulation, State agencies may not make any new commitments of funds for any purpose to a school district in federally assisted programs unless an assurance of compliance, court order, or satisfactory desegregation plan has been submitted to the State agency.

Where a school district or other agency submits a plan of desegregation, the State agency may not take any of the above actions until the State agency is notified by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, after review of the plan, that Federal financial assistance may be extended.

Thus, for example, after January 2, 1965, no new agreements, contracts, or project approvals for vocational education programs, or for vocational education school construction, or for equipment or remodeling under title III, National Defense Education Act, or for guidance and counseling programs under title V, National Defense Education Act, or for training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act or Area Redevelopment Act, or for library services or construction may be entered into or approved by the State agency unless an assurance of compliance, court order, or approved plan is first obtained from the applicant.

Federal financial assistance due and payable pursuant to commitments made by the State agency prior to January 3, 1965, may be paid in spite of the failure of a school district or other agency to submit the required assurance of compliance, court order, or desegregation plan. However, the State agency in such case must notify the Commissioner of Education of such failure, and Federal financial assistance to the district may be terminated pursuant to the procedures for compliance set forth in section 80.8(c) of the regulation.

After the effective date of a final order entered by the responsible Department official under section 80.10 of the regulation that a school district or other agency is not in compliance with the regulation, the State agency may not make available any Federal financial assistance to such school district or other agency where the provision of such assistance is inconsistent with or prohibited by any provision in such final order.

V. DIRECT FEDERAL ASSISTANCE (PUBLIC LAW 815 AND PUBLIC LAW 874)

Effective as of January 3, 1965, the effective date of the regulation, the U.S. Commissioner of Education will not approve any new projects for Federal financial assistance to a school district or other agency or any other direct assistance program under Public Law 815 or Public Law 874, unless an assurance of compliance, court order, or desegregation plan has been submitted to the Office of Education.

Where Federal financial assistance is due and payable pursuant to an application approved by the Office of Education prior to January 3, 1965, such assistance may continue except as it may be terminated pursuant to the procedures for compliance provided in section 80.8(c) of the regulation.

VI. PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTING ASSURANCES

The instructions below represent the procedures for submitting assurances of compliance by school districts and other agencies to meet the administrative requirements of the Office of Education. The State educational agencies may instruct school districts and other agencies to file additional copies of the assurance with the State agency for its administrative purposes.

When indicating the name of the school district or other agency, give the full legal name of the district or agency. Also indicate on the form the county and State in which the district or agency is located. If the school district is a Public Law 815 or Public Law 874 applicant, in order to secure prompt processing of the applications, it should indicate the most recent project numbers for these applications, for example, Iowa–64–XXXXX.

Under the signature on form HEW 441, type the name and title of the official signing.

State administered Federal assistance programs

School districts receiving funds only under State administered programs (such as vocational education, titles III and V of National Defense Education Act, etc.) and not receiving funds under any direct assistance programs (such as Public Law 874 or Public Law 815) submit two signed copies of the assurance, court order, or plan to the State agency. The State agency will retain one copy and forward one copy to the Office of Education.

Direct Federal assistance

For school districts receiving assistance only under assistance programs directly administered by the U.S. Office of Education (such as Public Law 815 or Public Law 874), file the same number of signed copies of the assurance, court order, or plan as is required for application under the particular program. Under Public Law 815 or Public Law 874, for instance, submit three signed copies of the assurance, court order, or plan to the State agency in accordance with the usual procedure for application under these programs. The State agency will retain one copy and forward one copy to the appropriate regional office of the U.S. Office of Education and one to the U.S. Office of Education.

Both direct and State administered programs

If the school district is receiving assistance under both direct assistance and State administered programs, follow the procedures above for direct assistance, but make sure that one copy of the assurance, court order, or plan is sent to the State agency for its files if this is not otherwise provided for.

Since the particular office approving a grant at either the State or Federal level cannot approve a grant unless it has on file a satisfactory assurance, court order, or desegregation plan, the local agency is responsible for making sure that the required copies of these documents have been received by the appropriate office.

Local agency to retain one copy

The local school district should keep at least one copy of the signed assurance, court order, or desegregation plan for its files.

EXPLANATION OF HEW FORM 441, ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE REGULATION UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT XXXXXXX

Section 80.4 of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's regulation effectuating title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that every application to the Department for Federal financial assistance shall contain or be accompanied by an assurance that the program or facility to be assisted will be conducted or operated in compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act and with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to the Department's regulation.

Section 80.4 further provides that "the form of the foregoing assurance and the extent to which like assurances will be required of subgrantees, contractors, transferees, successors in interest and other participants," shall be specified by the responsible Department official. Under this authority, HEW form No. 441 has been specified as the form of assurance which shall apply to all applications for Federal financial assistance (except for continuing State programs which must meet the requirements of sec. 80.4(b) and school districts availing themselves of sec. 80.4(c) of the regulation) submitted to the Department after January 3, 1965, also the circumstances have been specified under which an applicant shall obtain comparable written assurance of compliance from its subgrantees, contractors, and transferees. (See answers to questions 11 and 12 below in this regard.)

HEW form No. 441 constitutes a legally enforceable agreement to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to the regulation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued thereunder. Applicants are urged to read the Department's regulation before executing the assurance.

The following explanation of the requirements of the Department's regulation and the examples of the kinds of discriminatory practices prohibited by them are for the guidance of the applicants.

1. By executing the assurance (HEW form No. 441), what does an applicant agree to do?

Answer. The applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in providing to individuals any service, financial aid, or other benefit under any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department.

2. What is meant by "distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin"?

Answer. "Distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin" includes (1) any type of segregation, separate or different treatment, or other discrimination on that ground; (2) the imposition of any admission, enrollment quota, eligibility, or other requirement or condition which individuals must meet in order to be provided any service, financial aid, or other benefit under a program or to be afforded an opportunity to participate in a program, if the race, color, or national origin of individuals is considered in determining whether they meet any such requirement or condition; (3) the use of membership in a group as a basis for the selection of individuals for any purpose, if in selecting members of the group there is discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin; and (4) the assignment of personnel to provide services, or the assignment of times or places for the provision of services, on the basis of the race, color, or national origin of the individuals to be served. It does not, however, include distinctions on the ground of race, color, or national origin determined by the responsible Department official to be necessary to the conduct of research or experimental programs having as their primary objective the discovery of new knowledge concerning special characteristics of particular racial or other ethnic groups.

3. What is meant by "service, financial aid or other benefit"?

Answer. "Service, financial aid, or other benefit" under a program receiving Federal financial assistance includes any education or training, any evaluation, guidance, counseling, or placement service; any health, welfare, rehabilitation, housing, or recreational service; any referral of individuals for any of the foregoing services; any scholarship, fellowship or traineeship stipend or allowance, and any loan or other financial assistance or benefit (whether in cash or in kind), which is made available to individuals (1) with the aid of Federal financial assistance, or (2) with the aid of the applicant's or of other non-Federal funds required to be made available for the program as a condition to the receipt of Federal financial assistance, or (3) in or through a facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance or the non-Federal matching funds referred to in (2).

4. What requirements are placed on the use of facilities?

Answer. The applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in making available to individuals the use of any land, building, equipment, or other facility leased, acquired, constructed, improved, or equipped with the aid of Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department, including—

(a) the use of any room, dormitory, ward, or other space in the facility;

(b) the use of any equipment in the facility;

(c) the use of any office, waiting room, restroom, eating, recreational, concession, or other accommodation or convenience provided in the facility;

(d) the use of any facility not provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance if the availability of such facility is required as a condition to the receipt of Federal financial assistance for the federally assisted facility.

5. What requirements are placed on the opportunities to participate in a program receiving Federal assistance?

Answer. The applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in affording opportunities to individuals to participate (other than as employees) in any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended by the Department to the applicant, including opportunities to participate—

(a) as providers of any service, financial aid, or other benefit to individuals under the program (e.g., as physicians, surgeons, dentists, or other professional practitioners seeking the privilege of practicing in a federally aided hospital or other facility),

(b) as conferees, observers, consultants, or advisers, or as members of advisory or planning groups, or

(c) as volunteers (e.g., as voluntary workers, or as patients or other subjects of study or experimentation in research, survey, demonstration, or like programs).

6. Does that mean that an applicant who signs the Department's assurance may nevertheless make distinctions among his employees on the basis of race, color, or national origin?

Answer. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act does not concern itself with employment practices except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment. Thus, where a basic objective of the program is to provide employment, the applicant's employment practices are subject to the Department's regulation. However, even where this is not the case an applicant may be precluded from engaging in any discriminatory employment practices under the provisions of title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Executive Orders Nos. 10925 and 11114, and the merit system regulations.

7. When an applicant's employment practices are covered by the Department's regulation, what requirements must be met?

Answer. The applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in its employment practices (including recruitment or recruitment advertising, hiring, layoff or termination, upgrading, demotion, or transfer, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, and use of facilities) with respect to individuals seeking employment or employed under any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department, in those programs where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment to such individuals. This includes programs under which the employment is provided—

(a) as a means of extending financial assistance to students or needy persons,

(b) to students, fellows, interns, residents, or others in training for related employment (including research associates or assistants in training for research work), or

(c) to reduce unemployment or to provide remunerative activity to individuals who because of severe handicaps cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market.

8. What effect will the regulation have on a college or university's admission practices or other practices related to the treatment of students?

Answer. An institution of higher education which applies for any Federal financial assistance of any kind must agree that it will make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in the admission practices or any other practices of the institution relating to the treatment of students.

(a) "Student" includes any undergraduate, graduate, professional, or postgraduate student, fellow, intern, student, or other trainee receiving education or training from the institution.

(b) "Admission practices" include recruiting and promotional activities, application

requirements, eligibility conditions, qualifications, preferences, or quotas used in selecting individuals for admission to the institution, or any program of the institution, as students.

(c) "Other practices relating to the treatment of students" of opportunities to participate in any educational, research, cultural, athletic, recreational, social, or other program or activity; the performance evaluation, discipline, counseling of students; making available to students any housing, eating, health, or recreational service; affording work opportunities, or scholarship, loan or other financial assistance to students; and making available for the use of students any building, room, space, materials, equipment, or other facility or property.

9. Does the assurance of nondiscrimination apply to the entire operation of an institution?

Answer. Insofar as the assurance given by the applicant relates to the admission or other treatment of individuals as students, patients, or clients of an institution of higher education, a school, hospital, nursing home, center, or other institution owned or operated by the applicant, or to the opportunity to participate in the provision of services, financial aid, or other benefits to such individuals, the assurance applies to the entire institution. In the case of a public school system the assurance would be applicable to all of the elementary or secondary schools operated by the applicant.

10. What about a university which operates several campuses?

Answer. Section 80.4(d)(2) of the regulation provides for a more limited assurance only where an institution can demonstrate that the practices in part of its operation in no way affect its practice in the program for which it seeks Federal funds. This would be a rare case.

11. If an applicant intends to make use of other individuals to help carry out the federally assisted program, does the requirement not to discriminate apply to such a subgrantee or contractor?

Answer. It does. The applicant must require any individual, organization, or other entity which it utilizes, to which it subgrants, or with which it contracts or otherwise arranges to provide services, financial aid, or other benefits under, or to assist it in the conduct of, any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department, or with which it contracts or otherwise arranges for the use of any facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance for a purpose for which the Federal financial assistance was extended, to comply fully with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the regulation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued thereunder.

12. Must this assurance of nondiscrimination by the subgrantee, etc., be in writing?

Answer. In the case (1) of any contractual or other arrangement with another such individual or entity which will continue for an indefinite period or for a period of more than 3 months, (2) of any subgrant, or (3) of any conveyance, lease, or other transfer of any real property or structures thereon provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department, the applicant shall obtain from such other person, subgrantee, or transferee, an agreement, in writing, enforceable by the applicant and by the United States, that such other individual or entity, subgrantee, or transferee will carry out its functions under such subgrant, or contractual or other arrangement, or will use the transferred property, as the case may be, in accordance with title VI of the act and the regulation will otherwise comply herewith.

13. What obligations does the applicant have to inform beneficiaries, participants, and others of the provisions of the regulation?

Answer. The applicant must make available to beneficiaries, participants, and other interested persons information regarding the provisions of the regulation and protections against discrimination provided under title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The Department will issue shortly more detailed instructions on carrying out this phase of the regulation.

14. What obligations does the applicant have to keep records and to make them available to the Department?

Answer. From time to time, applicants may be required to submit reports to the Department, and the regulation provides that the facilities of the applicant and all records, books, accounts, or other sources of information pertinent to the applicant's compliance with the regulation be made available for inspection during normal business hours on request of an officer or employee of the Department specifically authorized to make such inspections. More detailed instructions in this regard will also be forthcoming from the Department in the near future.

15. Must separate assurance forms be filed with each application?

Answer. As a general rule once a valid assurance is given it will apply to any further application as long as there is no indication of a failure to comply.

ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE REGULATION UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT [redacted]

Carroll County Board of Education (hereinafter called the "applicant") hereby agrees that it will comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-352) and all requirements imposed by or pursuant to the regulation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (45 CFR pt. 80) issued pursuant to that title, to the end that, in accordance with title VI of that act and the regulation, no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the applicant receives Federal financial assistance from the Department; and hereby gives assurance that it will immediately take any measures necessary to effectuate this agreement.

If any real property or structure thereon is provided or improved with the aid of Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department, this assurance shall obligate the applicant, or in the case of any transfer of such property, any transferee, for the period during which the real property or structure is used for a purpose for which the Federal financial assistance is extended or for another purpose involving the provision of similar services or benefits. If any personal property is so provided, this assurance shall obligate the applicant for the period during which it retains ownership or possession of the property. In all other cases, this assurance shall obligate the applicant for the period during which the Federal financial assistance is extended to it by the Department.

This assurance is given in consideration of and for the purpose of obtaining any and all Federal grants, loans, contracts, property, discounts or other Federal financial assistance extended after the date hereof to the applicant by the Department, including installment payments after such date on account of applications for Federal financial assistance which were approved before such date. The applicant recognizes and agrees that such Federal financial assistance will be extended in reliance on the representations and agreements made in this assurance, and that the United States shall have the right to seek judicial enforcement of this assurance. This assurance is binding on the applicant, its successors, transferees, and assignees, and the person or persons whose signatures appear below are authorized to sign this assurance on behalf of the applicant.

CARROLL COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION.
By J. C. BROWN, *Chairman of Board.*
Dated March 1, 1965.
CARROLLTON, GA.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 7, 1965]

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY RIGHTS PLEDGES INVALID, U.S. SAYS—ONLY FIVE STATE SYSTEMS ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDS

(By Hal Gulliver)

Certificates of compliance to the 1964 Civil Rights Act signed by 170 of Georgia's 196 school systems are in effect worthless scraps of paper, Federal officials say.

These systems are still in violation of the new law, according to U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare Department spokesmen.

Their schools do not qualify for Federal aid funds, despite the decision by local boards of education to sign the certificates.

The hard-line policy spelled out by U.S. Office of Education officials in Washington this weekend will require all presently segregated school systems to submit detailed desegregation plans for next September.

"They were misinformed somewhere along the line," Davis S. Seeley, U.S. Office of Education, says of the Georgia school officials.

Seeley, special assistant to U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, was named last month to direct the equal educational opportunities program which administers titles IV and VI of the Civil Rights Act affecting school desegregation.

"Georgia got most off on the wrong track," Seeley said.

However, large numbers of segregated school systems in other Southern States still do not qualify for Federal aid because they signed certificates of compliance, Federal officials say.

Segregated school systems will be allowed to file again "as soon as the thing gets straightened out," Seeley said.

Compliance with the Civil Rights Act demands at least a substantial start on desegregation, he added.

State educators contend that this amounts to a drastic shift in policy by the U.S. Office of Education.

"The HEW office sent 1,000 copies down of the certificate of compliance. This position that Mr. Seeley's office is now taking, that segregated systems could not sign, was never stated. The fact that 1,000 copies were sent down makes you wonder if there weren't some second thoughts," Dr. Allen Smith, associate State school superintendent, said.

"A segregated school district would have to file a voluntary desegregation plan" (rather than sign the certificate), Seeley said this weekend.

Only a "totally desegregated" school system would be eligible to sign the certificate, he declared.

Federal officials insist that the instructions sent to local school districts in January made it clear that a segregated system could not sign the certificate of compliance.

One statement in the instructions reads as follows:

"A school district not yet fully desegregated or otherwise not in a position to give an assurance of full compliance * * * should not execute form No. HEW 441" (the certificate).

Georgia education officials, on the advice of the State attorney general's office, interpreted the certificate as a "statement of intent" pledging a local school system not to discriminate after signing.

State educators told local school officials that a school system had three choices: (1) Submit a copy of the Federal court order under which their schools were desegre-

gating, (2) send in a detailed desegregation plan, or (3) sign the certificate of compliance pledging an end to all discrimination in schools.

One complaint made by Federal officials is that Georgia educators failed to invite an HEW spokesman to attend three meetings held in the State in January to explain the Civil Rights Act to local school officials.

This may be one reason for the confusion, Seeley said.

"As a practical matter, plans should be filed now to be put into effect by September," Seeley said.

School systems filing worthless certificates of compliance will be contacted in the next several days, he continued, and told that they must submit desegregation plans.

As it now stands, only 5 of Georgia's 196 school systems are unquestionably in compliance with the Civil Rights Act and eligible for Federal funds. These are the systems now operating under Federal court order.

Sixteen school systems have already submitted desegregation plans, but these must be approved by the U.S. Office of Education.

One Department of Education official said that most of these plans will undoubtedly be rejected by Federal officials because they include requirements already rejected by Federal courts.

At stake is more than $50 million in Federal funds received by Georgia schools last year. State educators estimate that the State will receive an additional $39 million per year under President Johnson's proposed education program now in Congress.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 8, 1965]

SANDERS SHARPLY CRITICIZES RIGID U.S. SCHOOL POLICY

(By Hal Gulliver)

Gov. Carl Sanders was sharply critical Sunday of the hard-line policy effecting school desegregation announced by Federal officials during the weekend.

"I think it's a pretty ridiculous situation when people send out forms, and then say they're worthless," Sanders declared.

Certificates of compliance to the 1964 Civil Rights Act signed by 170 of Georgia's 196 school systems are of no value, Federal officials say.

Schools in the systems are not in compliance with the new law and are still not eligible to receive Federal funds, according to officials of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

These school systems must now send in detailed school desegregation plans for next September to qualify for Federal money, officials say.

Sanders failed in a last-minute attempt to persuade Federal officials to ease the newly stated hard-line interpretation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

"I've done all I can," the Governor said reluctantly, after conferring by [redacted] with Lyndon B. Johnson, U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, and other Federal officials during the weekend.

Georgia schools could lose over $50 million per year in Federal money by failing to comply with the Civil Rights Act. At stake also is an additional $39 million per year which Georgia would receive under President Johnson's education bill pending in Congress.

Only five Georgia school systems—those under Federal court order—are now fully in compliance with the law.

The statement of policy by Federal officials could create "an utterly hopeless situation," in Georgia school districts, Sanders said.

TRYING TO FORCE

"They're trying to force people to go out and force a situation," he continued.

"Federal officials should never have mailed them out (the certificates of compliance) unless they expected them to be signed and returned," the Governor said.

Sanders said this represents a "complete about-face" on policy by U.S. Office of Education officials.

"They should have known what they were doing," he said.

Georgia school systems were "misinformed somewhere along the line," David S. Seeley, U.S. Office of Education, commented.

Any segregated school system will have to file a plan of desegregation sometime this spring, Seeley said, rather than simply sign the certificate of compliance.

Only a totally desegregated school system would be eligible to sign the certificates, he added.

This interpretation of the certificates was never stated until now, Dr. Allen Smith, associate State school superintendent, contends.

Earlier, State and local school officials believed that a segregated school system could sign the certificates as a statement of intent that local school officials would not discriminate in anyway from the time the certificate was signed.

ATLANTA, GA.,
March 12, 1965.

Hon. JOHN F. FLYNT, JR.,
Representatives House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The dedicated local school board members of our great State of Georgia and the administrators of our several school systems are highly indignant over the fact that their integrity was not only questioned but made a "public spectacle" by certain individuals in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare when they questioned the intelligence, deliberated intent and dedicated resolve of the great majority of Georgia's 1,130-odd school board members when they, by official action, placed on public record their unqualified intent to comply with the requirement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by signing the certificate of compliance submitted to them through proper channels together with instructions which were unquestioned at the time and which they followed, as bitter as was the experience which they underwent in so doing. You are respectfully requested to render every possible assistance in clarifying the highly detrimental situation and in rectifying the great injustice which has been perpetrated upon some of the finest and most public spirited citizens in America.

Respectfully,

JACK ACREE,
Executive Secretary,
Georgia School Board Association.

VILLA RICA, GA.,
March 7, 1965.

Hon. JOHN F. FLYNT, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We are very much disturbed about the item in the Atlanta Journal-Constitution this date advising that the boards of education have not complied with Civil Rights Act. Please give us your interpretation of this law together with what we should do to protect our schools against the loss of Federal aid and the violations of the Civil Rights Act.

Yours very truly,

J. C. BROWN,
Chairman,
Carroll County Board of Education.

CARROLL COUNTY
BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Carrollton, Ga., March 8, 1965.

Hon. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLYNT: As Mr. J. C. Brown, chairman Carroll County Board of Education, indicated to you in his [redacted] conversation Sunday, we were surprised and disturbed by the apparent change in the interpretation of the civil rights compliance procedure by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is my feeling that the school boards of Georgia acted in good faith when they signed the compliance agreements. I know personally that several superintendents and boards right here in our area have been working diligently to prepare practical transfer procedures so that this problem could be handled in an orderly manner.

I personally cannot see how the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare can refuse to accept these certificates without breaking faith with the 170 Georgia school boards.

We are enclosing a copy of the compliance agreement form along with other materials dealing with this topic as you requested.

We appreciate your interest in this problem.

Sincerely yours,

QUINTON PRINCE.

Mr. Chairman, I sometimes wonder why any Member of the Georgia delegation addresses himself to either this amendment or to this bill because officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have been quoted in the press of our State as saying that Georgia is not eligible to participate and that the Department does not honor and does not consider as valid the assurances of compliance which as of March 5, 1965, had been signed in good faith by at least 170 of the 196 school boards of our State.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the State of Georgia and the people of the State of Georgia have done their utmost in good faith to comply with recent legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States in 1964 which is referred to in the documents I have placed in the RECORD of these proceedings.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain portions of that act of 1964 with which the majority of the people of Georgia find ourselves in violent disagreement. But we are good citizens who abide by the laws duly enacted by the Congress of the United States. I have faith in our State and in our people. I know that however distasteful it may have been to sign such assurances, I know they were signed in good faith.

When we are told in advance by a spokesman for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the Department does not trust the people of Georgia, that they do not trust the Georgia school boards, and that they do not accord to us the good faith which we accord to them, then personally and on behalf of the people of my State I resent it.

Mr. Chairman, I must inquire whether there is going to be any reversal of this outrageous position which has been taken by the Department officials.

Since the quoted article appeared on March 7, 1965, I have been in conferences with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with Mr. David S. Seeley, of the U.S. Office of Education, who is quoted in the article of March 7, 1965, as the spokesman for the Department.

The assurance of compliance—HEW Form 441—is prospective in its language. This form was prepared by the Department and the Department is responsible for the language it contains.

The Department officials have broken faith with the school boards of Georgia and have rejected the offers of good faith made by responsible school board members all over Georgia.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POWELL. I move that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLYNT) there were—ayes, 181, noes, 114.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. POWELL and Mr. GOODELL.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes, 179, noes, 123.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I would say that we have a question here of quantity and quality. There is no reason for us to expect that we are going to have the answer qualitatively, because California in 1926 went into its first equalization bill in education and is still trying to find equality. So we will have to look a long time to find that.

Education does not happen in a vacuum, it happens qualitatively in society. If the State makes a qualitative effort to do something in education, ask what it is doing in other fields, because that is the quality effort.

I cannot think of quality and quantity without thinking of what I believe would be the favorite story of the majority leader.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HANNA. You will not hear the story that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, the difficulties which we in the less industrialized States face occur because of a disparity between the amount of money we can pay our teachers and that paid in the more industrialized States. In other words, because our disposable per capita income is lower, then our tax base is smaller. Thus it is difficult to compete, for example, in paying adequate teacher's salaries.

This bill, by putting more money into the richer areas, will widen the gap of opportunity and lessen our competitive ability. To me it is incredible that anyone sincerely interested in the disadvantaged youth of our Nation would vote to widen the gap of opportunity, would refuse to give the same amount of money or assistance to every child regardless of his State or community. This is simply a matter of equity.

The young people of the South or of any other area deserve better and more honest treatment.

I support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]. I am grateful to her for offering it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

The school boards of Georgia have overwhelmingly shown their good faith in compliance with the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As of March 5 this year, 170 out of 196 school boards have signed certificates of compliance. Although no charges of bad faith have been made, the officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have not accepted these certificates.

The Department's officials will accept certificates only from school districts that are under a court order or that have submitted acceptable plans of desegregation. This is true, even though these officials privately admit that these requirements may well lead to additional suits and additional court orders rather than voluntary compliance.

In my conversations with Department officials, I was told quite frankly that our State of Georgia had no choice. I was told that once the bill we are debating today is passed, the Federal school aid to Georgia will be so great that Georgia will have to comply with Federal regulations, no matter how arbitrary.

My points, Mr. Speaker, are these: Georgia has acted in a responsible manner; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has replied in an arbitrary manner; and, with the passage of this bill, the actions of the Department will no doubt become more arbitrary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY].

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I rise as a member of the Committee unequivocally to support the Green amendment.

The whole point of title I is to provide funds for those children who are most educationally deprived, the children from poor and welfare families.

Why should a poor child in Maine or Mississippi get less Federal money than a poor child in New York or California?

The present formula in title I discriminates against the poor children who happen to live in States which are presently spending less than the national average per pupil expenditure.

It is discriminating against those children who have probably already suffered more than any others from an inadequate education.

Education is a national matter.

We cannot think of education in terms of how much our own States will get from this or any other bill.

Mrs. GREEN, who introduced this amendment, comes from the State of Oregon, a State which will receive less under title I by her proposed amendment.

Mrs. GREEN is to be commended for her devotion to the education of all American children, whether in Oregon, Oklahoma, or Ohio.

The present formula would in fact punish in the future those States which have failed to provide adequately for the education of their children, often only because they were financially unable to do so.

For if we allot money to the States on the basis of what they have expended in the past, what they are expending now, we will be perpetuating the difference in educational opportunity between the so-called rich and poor States.

Our country was founded and has grown and will continue to grow on the solid foundation of equal opportunity for all. Educational opportunity is the most important opportunity in a person's life.

For we all know the tragic statistics which are the story of an inadequate education. We know that the lieftime earnings of a person are directly related to the amount and quality of his education; that the tragedy of unemployment is far more common for those with less education; that the embarrassment of welfare is far more likely for those with inadequate education.

The year 1965 is not the time and the education of our children must not be the issue in which we allow ourselves the luxury of thinking in local terms.

Together, as representatives of all the people and all the children of the United States, we should, we must, support this amendment.

And then we can pass the education bill knowing we have made it the best, the most equitable possible bill.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time remaining to me to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was not given the opportunity to speak on this bill. I am a member of this committee. I have devoted my time to it. I regret that my chairman cut me off with but three-quarters of a minute to talk. But, regardless of the outcome of the Green amendment, I am going to vote for this bill because it is a good bill. All I am asking you to do is to vote for the Green amendment because the Green amendment does simple justice to poor kids in the United States wherever they may be. It seems to me that we as Americans have one trust and one responsibility and that is to treat the poor children alike whether they be in New York, Chicago, Ill., Florida, California, or any place else. All you are doing, if you do not adopt the Green amendment, is making it tougher for poor children in Mississippi and Florida to catch up with the children in the rest of the United States. The late great President wrote a book called "Profiles in Courage." Mrs. Green here today typifies that book. She is voting against the leadership of her party. Her amendment takes money from her State and makes it available to help poor children in poorer sections of the United States. No Member of this House is better informed on legislation affecting education matters. She is pre-

senting this amendment because she knows it is correct even if it is not at this time popular. Her courage and wisdom should be an inspiration to all of us to vote for her amendment and after it is adopted to vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I must rise in opposition to this amendment, as I have great and deep respect for the gentlewoman from Oregon. The principle is very simple. The cost in different school districts varies. I believe this amendment could discriminate against high-cost school districts and therefore against children in these districts. Therefore, I must regretfully oppose it.

And I would add that in Westchester County we have poverty amid affluence; 1 in 12 families lives in abject poverty and 1 in 5 families in serious poverty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM FORD. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I rise to express amazement that our friends on the other side of the aisle are seeking to support an amendment which removes from this bill the most important provision for incentive at the local level. A party which consistently insisted Federal programs should always encourage maximum participation by the States and local governments and always encourage local incentives. They would strip away from this bill these incentives, and invite State legislatures to count how many children will qualify in their State and multiply it by $200 and then deduct that from the appropriations they make to support education in their State next year. If you adopt this amendment you will do, in effect, the opposite of what this bill intends to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with no little amusement to the viewpoint expressed by some—not all I am glad to say, of my friends on the Republican side—at their expressed interest in helping poor children. I say this because I have here a press release dated the 8th of March containing a story and a summary of the Republican tax credit education bill which they confess will cost the U.S. Treasury $5 billion and in which bill they propose only $300 million for the education of poor children, as compared with $1.6 billion which was proposed in title I of H.R. 2362 for assisting in the education of poor children.

Methinks the Republicans do protest too much:

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN].

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MARTIN OF ALABAMA

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, let us pause for a moment and think about some of the children to whom we are addressing ourselves today as underprivileged. I come from the great State of Alabama. Historically it has had many problems, problems that we of this generation for the most part did not create but problems which fate itself wrought. One of our great problems is to upgrade the educational level of our citizenry.

Let me direct the attention of the Members who went to Selma and the gentlemen today who are working conscientiously to help upgrade the Negroes among our citizens and to help grant them the right to vote—which, incidentally, I am for—that in many counties of Alabama 80 percent of the people are of the Negro race; and 60 to 70 percent in many other counties. The children you are talking about today as underprivileged, for the most part, need more help than any children in the United States.

I want to ask you if you are going to crusade in this country, let us crusade with honesty and integrity and let us tell the people of this country that education is No. 1—and it is No. 1. And if we are going to help these people we need to help them secure for themselves a right in America to earn with dignity a spot in this great and bountiful land which they can do only when they have sufficient education.

Do not vote against them. Do not vote against this amendment. If you vote against this amendment you vote against the very people that you say you want to help. Let the press, let the gallery, let America look at you today and let them see what vote you cast. Let us see if you are going to vote to help educate these people of the South. They need your help, they need your conviction, they need your honesty, they need your integrity. They need from the gentlewoman from Oregon her amendment to be passed today.

I will lay the case at rest, but I want you to bear that in mind when you cast your vote.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt that this amendment will be defeated. That has been demonstrated. But I do want to place a few facts in the record prior to the defeat of the amendment. One is that the men who are proponents of this amendment, backing the gentlewoman from Oregon, except for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY], are sworn enemies of this bill from your Subcommittee on General Education.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I also resent that kind of statement, since I was the proponent and sponsored the amendment—to say that everybody who supports this particular amendment is an enemy of the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman did not hear my remarks. I said the proponents who are backing her, except for the two gentlemen named, are against this bill. I did not say she was. I will say that the gentlewoman did vote for this bill with the present formula. I will say that the gentlewoman did sign the majority report. I will say that I convened two caucuses of the Democrats and the Republicans who were in favor of this bill in order for them to discuss her ideas with the gentlewoman from Oregon.

And so I have come to you, Mr. Chairman, having clearly indicated that I have done my task as chairman in a fair way, I am sure the gentlewoman will agree.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. Yes, I gladly yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor has been very fair during the years I have served under his chairmanship on the committee. But I think the RECORD should also show that I did not sign the majority report. I did not even see the majority report before it was filed. It was never sent to me nor to my office. I did not see fit to file any minority report but decided to come to the floor of the House with the amendments which I have.

I would also suggest to the gentleman from New York and remind the gentleman that at the two caucuses I did offer my formula and objected to the formula which is now contained in the bill. If the gentleman remembers, the majority of the Democrats were opposed to it. It was at that point that I decided the matter should be taken to the floor; is that not correct?

Mr. POWELL. No; it is partially correct. What we asked was for you to give us a detailed analysis of the formula.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. As of what date?

Mr. POWELL. As of the last caucus.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. This morning?

Mr. POWELL. No, before that. Because I have your formula as of yesterday.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. When I first came to the Congress and submitted an amendment I was very naive and very green. I thought, at least, I was being gracious to the proponents of the bill and suggested the amendment in advance. I learned then that one does not give them a week to work on it in order to tear it to pieces.

Mr. POWELL. Well, the gentlewoman knows that I have always been fair with the gentlewoman and I shall continue to be fair with you.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the committee has reported the bill, the majority of the committee, and it is very equitable and fair.

We have been fighting for this legislation for many, many years.

I can remember only several years ago under former President Eisenhower when the enacting clause was stricken out by four or five votes and the great majority of my Republican colleagues at that time voted to strike out the enacting clause, including some of the Republican leaders at that time.

Mr. Chairman, we have been fighting for years for this legislation. We are now in a position where we can put an effective bill through. The amendment which has been offered in good faith by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], if adopted, may seriously interfere with the passage of the bill.

Therefore, I urge the defeat of the amendment and the passage of the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT], who did not get all of the time that he desired during the general debate, that I shall gladly assist him in getting such time when the next section is read. However, there was a misunderstanding between the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] about that and I did not know about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN].

The preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I was interested to hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] say that this bill, if we enact this amendment, will have no incentive in it.

The amendment does not affect the incentive section of title I. The incentive section remains so that we can in future years, if the expenditures are increased, these funds will be increased. The amendment also does not affect the section which bars the reduction of expenditures by the local authorities in receiving funds. Both of those sections remain intact.

Mr. Chairman, I particularly appreciated the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] exposing my motives for supporting this legislation, as being completely virtuous and self-effacing. I believe this money should go where it is needed on an equal basis and not to the counties that can take care of their own problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] to close debate.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. POWELL and Mr. GOODELL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 136, noes 202.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate, and amendments thereto, to this title close at 6 o'clock.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate and amendments thereto to title I of this act close at 6 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that all debate on section 2 containing title I close at 6 o'clock.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PERKINS and Mr. QUIE.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 178, noes 78.

So the motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 70, strike out everything following line 8, through line 2 on page 89, and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"TITLE II—NATIONAL EQUAL EDUCATION DRIVE; GRANTS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR DEPRIVED CHILDREN

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 201. (a) The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Commissioner') shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the succeeding fiscal year a program of grants to State education agencies for the support of special educational programs for children who because of social, cultural, economic, or educational deprivation are unable to benefit fully from school attendance.

"(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the sum of $300,000,000, and for the succeeding fiscal year such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, for making such grants the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated for preceding fiscal year and the aggregate of the sums which were appropriated for such preceding year.

"ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 202. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 5 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in subsection (c). The remainder of such sums shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of children three to seven years of age, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than $3,000 in such State bears to the total number of such children in all the States.

"(b) The number of children three to seven years of age, inclusive, of families having less than $3,000 annual income in each State and in all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him from the Department of Commerce.

"(c) The amounts reserved by the Commissioners under subsection (a) shall be allotted by him among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for the type of assistance furnished under this title. For the purposes of this section, the term 'State' does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

"CERTIFICATION BY STATES

"SEC. 203. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the program authorized by this title shall submit through its State education agency to the Commissioner an application, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which certifies—

"(1) that payments under this title will be used for programs in school attendance areas having a high concentration of children of families having less than $3,000 annual income;

"(2) that the State has made a survey of school attendance areas to determine which have the greatest concentrations of such children and has established a system of area priorities (set forth in the application) to insure that payments will go to attendance areas having the greatest immediate need for the programs described in section 104;

"(3) that payments under this title will be used only for programs and projects which have been approved by the State educational agency pursuant to section 104 and which meet the requirements of that section, and that such agency will in all other respects comply with the provisions of this title;

"(4) that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies under this title; and

"(5) that the State educational agency will make an annual and such other reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title, including such reports as the Commissioner may require to evaluate the effectiveness of payments under this title and of particular programs assisted under it in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and assurance that such agency will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner and necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application which meets the requirements specified in subsection (a) and he shall not disapprove an application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State educational agency.

"USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

"SEC. 204. (a) Grants under this title may be used, in accordance with the applications approved under section 203, for—

"(1) the planning, supervision, and development of programs designed to assist educationally deprived children aged 3 to 7 years, inclusive, to overcome the handicaps that limit their ability to take advantage of educational opportunities, and of programs designed to improve education for such children, including the development of pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans so developed; and

"(2) the establishment, maintenance, and operation by local educational agencies of programs, including the construction of facilities and the acquisition of equipment, which meet the needs of educationally deprived children by providing educational services and activities such as—

"(A) preschool nursery and kindergarten training and education specially designed to

prepare deprived children for successful entrance and performance in elementary education;

"(B) remedial classes and programs in early childhood education;

"(C) supplemental programs and services, which might include programs outside of school hours, health and social services, and utilization of artistic and cultural resources available in the community;

"(D) improvement of educational resources for early childhood education through provision of special personnel, library materials, and audiovisual recreation and other equipment;

"(E) the use of a corps of master teachers and teaching assistants with special training who would be given additional incentives to work with educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having large concentrations of such children.

"(b) In the conduct of programs described in subsection (a) educational agencies shall in no case limit participation in such programs to children who are in attendance in public schools.

"(c) In the planning, development, and operation of the programs authorized by this title, State and local educational agencies may contract for facilities and services with other public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions in any manner permissible under State law.

"PAYMENT

"SEC. 205. (a) The amount which each State may be paid under this title for a fiscal year shall not exceed, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 100 per centum of the cost to the State and its political subdivisions in such year of carrying out programs described in section 104(a); for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such amount may not exceed 66⅔ per centum of such costs in such year.

"(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time pay to each State, in advance or otherwise, the amount which that State is eligible to receive under this title. Such payments shall take into account the extent (if any) to which any previous payment to such State educational agency under this title (whether or not in the same fiscal year) was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to it.

"(c)(1) No payment shall be made under this title for any fiscal year to a State which has taken into consideration payments under this title in determining the eligibility of any local educational agency in that State for State aid, or the amount of that aid, with respect to the free public education of children during that year or the preceding fiscal year.

"(2) No payments shall be made under this title to any local educational agency for any fiscal year unless the State educational agency finds that the combined fiscal effort of that agency and State with respect to the provision of free public education by that agency for the preceding fiscal year was not less than such combined fiscal effort for that purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

"LABOR STANDARDS

"SEC. 206. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"WITHHOLDING

"SEC. 207. Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any State educational agency, finds that there has been a failure to comply substantially with the certification set forth in the application of that State submitted under section 103(a), the Commissioner shall notify the agency that further payments will not be made to the State under this title (or, in his discretion, that the State educational agency shall not make further payments under this title to specified local educational agencies affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to the State under this title, or payments by the State educational agency under this title shall be limited to local educational agencies not affected by the failure, as the case may be.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 108. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its application submitted under section 103(a) or with his final action under section 107, such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner within areas of his jurisdiction as prescribed herein, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"COMPREHENSIVE STUDY

"SEC. 209. The Commissioner shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before December 31, 1967, a full report of the operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and his recommendations, if any, with respect to amendments to this title.

"AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 88–452

"SEC. 210. Section 205(a) of the Act of August 20, 1964 (Public Law 88–452; 78 Stat. 518), is amended by inserting the following sentence at the end thereof: *"Provided, however,* That such special remedial and other noncurricular eduactional assistance shall not include preschool nursery and kindergarten training or educational programs conducted by public educational agencies."

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 211. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(b) The term 'construction' means (1) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of equipment therefor; or (2) acquisition of existing structures not owned by any agency or institution making application for assistance under this Act; or (3) remodeling or alteration (including the acquisition, installation, modernization, or replacement of equipment) of existing structures; or (4) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

"(c) The term 'educationally deprived children' means children three to seven years of age, inclusive, who by reason of an adverse social environment, cultural handicaps, or low economic status (or combinations thereof) are unprepared for entry into elementary school or are unable to attain standards of academic performance which are normal for children in their age group.

"(d) The term 'equipment' includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and necessary enclosures or structures to house them, and includes all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of educational services, including items such as instructional equipment and necessary furniture, printed, published, and audiovisual instructional materials and books, periodicals, documents, and other related materials.

"(e) The term 'local educational agency' means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

"FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 212. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act or any Act amended by this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this Act or any Act amended by this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

"FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

"SEC. 113. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources or printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system."

Mr. QUIE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POWELL. Is this the bill, Mr. Chairman, addressing my remarks through you to the author of the substitute, that has the tax exemption in it?

Mr. QUIE. No. There is no tax exemption or tax credit or anything having anything to do with the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. POWELL. Oh. This is not your $5 billion bill, then.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you what this amendment, which is a substitute to title I, does and then my reasons for offering it.

This substitute provides $300 million which will be based on the number of children, ages 3 to 7, in the State, from families with incomes of less than $3,000. It will be allocated to each State according to the ratio that the children of this nature bear to the number of children of this nature in the Nation. So, each State will receive the same amount per child. This will provide 100-percent Federal funding the first year and two-thirds Federal funding the year thereafter. It would go toward programs to reach the culturally and socially deprived children of preschool age.

Title I of the bill has only a passing reference to preschool children in the declaration of policy. However, this would go specifically for the children of preschool age. Preschool nursery and kindergarten training and education specially designed for these deprived children—remedial classes and programs for children in their early education and so forth, including the use of a corps of master teachers and teaching assistants with special training. It would give them additional incentives to work with educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having large concentrations of such children.

My reason for offering this is I believe the Federal Government has the responsibility to improve the educational level of children before first grade. In my philosophy I believe that the States and local governments have the responsibilities in grades 1 through 12. The Federal Government has assisted for many years to a substantial degree in the grades above 12, at the higher educational levels. However, here is an area of great unmet need. The educationally deprived child being talked about for these 2 days in the bill H.R. 3262 are the ones who have been lost before they ever reached school for first grade. The children who are poverty stricken and result in the unemployed; the ones we were trying to reach last year in the antipoverty bill for the most part were lost before they ever attended public schools. We heard a great deal of testimony about these children. They are the easiest to reach and you can motivate them easier at this age than they can be at a subsequent age. The correction you have to make later on can be prevented if you have special programs designed to reach the children ages 3 to 6.

There is a great deal of information available to us if we would take the time to study it. Studies have been made by the Ford Foundation.

Martin Deutsch of the Institute of Developmental Studies of New York Medical College; Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner of the National Advisory Council of the Institute of Child Health and Human Development, who gave testimony on this subject last year; and you can read the report of the juvenile delinquency evaluation project in New York City by Prof. Robert M. MacIver. Each one of these people states that the time to reach these young people with special programs is before they ever start the first grade.

There is no sense in having all these expensive programs of trying to reach these kids at a later age and permit the breeding ground to continue. We must have the program specifically designed to reach these young people and the later programs will not be necessary.

I believe that my substitute, therefore, would reach the real problem better than the proposal we have before us in title I of H.R. 2362 and with a smaller amount of money.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I go back to the brief remarks I made during the limitation of debate several minutes ago when I said that I had a few dark suspicions about the genuine commitment of some—I hasten to point out some, not all—of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who were expressing such very deep concern about poor children. I think that the amendment offered by my good friend, for whom I have the highest regard, the gentleman from Minnesota, lends at least a modicum of credibility to my charge because this proposed amendment provides only $300 million in grants to aid educationally deprived children, whereas in title I of the committee bill we provide in excess of $1 billion to aid the poor children of this country in improving their educational opportunities.

I further point out that the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is very restricting indeed in that it applies to children only between ages 3 to 7—or is it 3 to 8?

Mr. QUIE. Three through seven, which would be the same as 3 to 8.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Whereas the committee bill will cover a far larger age group than does the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

I would point out that we have been given by the gentleman from Minnesota no very good estimate of how many children would be aided in his proposed amendment but it ought to be clear that with only $300 million as compared to $1 billion plus in title I of the committee bill far fewer children could be helped under his amendment, or they could be helped to a much smaller degree.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is a good example of offering a supposed bit of assistance without much substance to attack the very serious problem to which the committee bill is directed, and I hope very much that the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota will be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I believe under title I the bill as it is presented indicates that it is at the complete discretion of the local school unit to determine whether or not the preschool children will receive a program. I will ask my colleague from Indiana if it is not a fact that it is within the complete discretion of the local school authorities to devote all the money they receive to that program if they think it is needed?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. The administration bill in title I provides assistance for children aged 5 to 17, but not preschool age children.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman is not correct about that. Preschooling would include anything from birth to the first grade.

Mr. QUIE. When you compare my formula with that which is contained in the bill——

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not choose to yield further.

The formula in title I is based upon the number of children aged 5 to 17 coming from families of $2,000 a year or less. That is the formula. The funds provided under title I could be used for preschool children as well.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Yes. I yield further to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. What the gentleman really points out here is the fact that in title I of the bill the money does not necessarily have to be used only for the children ages 5 to 17. It can be used for any educationally deprived child in the school, and they can be the wealthiest kids in the district. This money is for them. This is for any child.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman is misleading when he makes that kind of statement. It is precisely the same kind of point that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] was earlier endeavoring to make, with no greater success, I venture to say, in his colloquy with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full time. I simply want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for offering this amendment. He was very active in producing this proposal. He has long been interested in the early school and preschool training program in an effort to try to interrupt the cycle of poverty—poverty in education and poverty in economic status.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program which aims itself directly at poor children at the age when they can be helped in the most effective way.

All of the testimony which we had before our committee indicated this to be the case. It gives the funds to the States, the educators, at the local level to utilize for this particular purpose.

It is a program that eliminates all of the dangers of Federal control, relying upon the States to take up the burden of trying to redirect some programs to help those young children from poor families.

Most of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, I am sure on this floor believe in that kind of a program. We should do it by stimulating the States and the local boards of education to move in this direction. It is an effective program and I might say it is title I of the Republican substitute which we would have liked to have offered on the floor here today.

Titles II, III, and IV include the tax credits and other provisions that we put in the Republican substitute. This is the Republican program from the members of the Education and Labor Committee aimed at helping the poor children between 3 and 8 years of age.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for the work that he did in developing the Republican substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that title I, as I said before, puts the Federal emphasis on areas where there is definite need. We have no idea whether the children of a preschool level will receive any assistance under the bill unless such an amendment is adopted.

Right now the administration proposal is to handle deprived children, culturally and socially deprived children, under the antipoverty program or through the Office of Economic Opportunity. There is a tremendous amount of experience which has been gained in our public school system, so I believe this proposal in my amendment would work better.

This amendment would provide that we leave these deprived children under the public school system, these children who are 3 through 7 years of age. These are the young people of which a study was made who live in Chicago. Some of them had not gone 6 blocks away from their home to see Lake Michigan, it was reported.

These are the young people in Chicago who when asked how big a horse or cow was in a picture, answered, "3 to 5 inches." They had not received any experience, no educational experience which they would automatically receive in associating with their parents if in a middle-class environment. Here is a crying need for Federal assistance. The incentive is needed for the local communities to reach these people. We have given categorical aid many times before. In 1917 we began the vocational program, we increased it in 1946, and again last year. We saw nothing wrong with that kind of aid. I ask you to give the same kind of categorical aid to the deprived children ages 3 to 7, these young people who need help more than anyone else, but they are the ones who have the least done for them. It has been recognized by authorities in this country that these young people are in need of this kind of aid.

I ask you to support this amendment.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the opportunity to question the sponsor of the amendment with regard to some details of the amendment. It is my understanding that the amendment would allocate $300 million to ages 3 to 7 only; is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct, 3 through 7 only.

Mr. CAREY. That would be the first grade in the public school system?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. CAREY. What provision would be made for children not in public schools?

Mr. QUIE. It would go to children of parents who normally send children to public schools. This would permit the money to be spent using the facilities of public schools similar to the way they do in Baltimore, using the facilities of churches, for instance, to reach these children. The people hired by the Public Education Agency would use these facilities because they are being used otherwise only on Sunday.

Mr. CAREY. Your amendment limits the entire bill to the preschool area alone. There is nothing in here for those who might use this special education service to receive any assistance whatsoever if they are over the age of 7?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. That is the responsibility of the local education agencies.

Mr. CAREY. Do I also understand that the allocation of funds in this bill would be on the same basis?

Mr. QUIE. It would be exactly the same as this except we use the $3,000 figure rather than $2,000 in order to include more people.

Mr. CAREY. I must continue my opposition to the amendment. I would suggest the gentleman's amendment is too meager and does not go far enough. I am pleased to see the majority recognizing some of these facts; that Federal assistance is popular legislation, but has been strongly opposed by the majority in the past. There must be some others who definitely need the same kind of service.

Mr. BRADEMAS. If the gentleman from New York will yield to me, I would like to ask another question of the author of the amendment. I think I heard the gentleman from Minnesota respond to the gentleman from New York if the State receiving funds under his proposal wished to establish preschool programs for private school students as well as public school students, the State would be free to do so?

Mr. QUIE. In a way we are talking about different situations. I do not know how we can provide for schoolchildren who have not attended school yet, the children of parents who would normally send these children to private schools after they get to the right age.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Can the gentleman answer this question: Has the gentleman any judgment on the relative percentage of students in each of these categories who would be assisted under his proposal?

Mr. QUIE. That would be pretty difficult. I do not see how you can make any determination.

Mr. CAREY. This is the classic attempt of the minority to offer amendments so that the bill will not help all the children who need help. How can we disregard the testimony of the local agency leaders who came to Congress and said they wanted to work across the whole range? How can we segregate the three to seven group? How can we here make our judgment prevail over theirs?

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment not because I do not favor the cultural training of prekindergarten, preschool children. My campaign to be a Member of this House was conducted in large measure on that very subject. I understand very well that with respect to a child of 6 or 7 or 8 years of age, his personality, his propensity to learn, his ability to hear and discriminate among the sounds of the English language, have largely been formed and the opportunity for remedial training is literally lost on his deaf ears in the grade school. I think it is true what the song says, that they have to be taught before it is too late, before they are six or seven or eight.

It was for that reason that yesterday I asked the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the subcommittee, whether or not in his opinion the language "preschool training" would include prekindergarten training of culturally deprived children. His answer was in the affirmative. My own opinion is that his answer was correct.

I would point out to the gentleman from Minnesota that if, in the discretion of all the school boards of the United States of America, preschool training was a matter of higher priority than grade school or secondary school training, under the bill as it now stands they have the discretion to use the entire funds appropriated for that very preschool training. Under this amendment the suggestion of $300 million for preschool training could very well by strong implication limit the amount of money under this bill to $300 million which could be spent for preschool training. So I rise in opposition to this amendment, because I do support the preschool training program, and I do not want to see the local authorities, the local school boards, told by the Federal Government, "You can only spend $300 million for this kind of program." That is the kind of Federal control that I certainly believe the Members of this House are opposed to.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I think the gentleman misunderstands my amendment. It is $300 million out of the $600 million for preschool training. Mine is a substitute for the entire title I. Whereas you put a limitation of $1,063 million on title I, I say $300 million and no more at this time can be spent for preschool training. There is in there money for those under age 17 under my amendment, if it is adopted.

So your argument that this is a control or earmarking of the funds does not apply any more than earmarking the funds at $1 billion. But you are correct in stating that my amendment only provides $300 million under title I. So my amendment will provide for less Federal expenditures in such cases.

Mr. JACOBS. My response then to the gentleman would be in two parts. First, I do believe under the present circumstances the local school districts in this country, when this bill becomes law, will have the discretion to use any amount of the money that is allocated to their school districts for preschool training. Second, by clear implication, if this amendment is adopted, those local school boards would be restricted to a smaller amount. I have seen too many judges decide too many cases on the implication language in statutes to doubt this result.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bill and the conduct of the debate on it is indeed a tribute to the persistency of those who have long been dedicated to achieving Federal injection into the primary and secondary schools of this country—regardless how they accomplish it.

We have had several formulas for Federal aid to education over the years, as you know. Many of them were devised by educators who perhaps have now come up with the very questionable formula that is embraced in this bill.

Of all the formulas in the past, many of which were not very good, this is the least sensible of all of them. The formula in this bill is, and every Member of this House has to admit this to himself, a buckshot approach to a problem that should demand pinpointing.

Some years ago we had a bill that would have channeled help to a particular school district where that school district could not provide proper teaching instruction and where the facilities were inadequate. That individual school district would then have been able to make application for aid, establish its financial need, and in this manner we would have directed the required aid accordingly—to where the need exists. Now we are going to use the 1959 census, as I understand it, to determine the formula but only when it is convenient. In the first place, the 1959 census because of its age is not going to be accurate obviously because of the changes which take place in 6 years. But, ah, here is another gimmick. If you look at the report, it says where such a census is not available—they would use the results of achievement tests.

Now goodness gracious, what relationship is there between achievement tests for the purpose of establishing this formula on the one hand and the formula of children coming from homes with a family income of less than $2,000?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me during the course of the excellent statement he is making, for which I commend him.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here having worked on this legislation since this Congress convened. I have seven amendments to title I. I think they bring out important points with reference to this legislation. The education bill that we are considering is perhaps the most important major piece of legislation that will come before this Congress this year. Those seven amendments, if I were to offer them, would have to be sent up to the Clerk's desk and acted upon without a word of explanation from me and without a word of answer from anybody on this floor. Is that the way that we as a great deliberative body should decide major issues or policy? The Great Society has turned today into a great steamroller. I think every liberal who calls himself a liberal sitting on the other side of the aisle who believes that these things should be debated and exposed to the light of day to arrive at a proper decision and a proper policy for our country should be ashamed.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

I submit that perhaps one of the reasons is, the longer this debate goes on the more evident it becomes how bad this legislation really is. The administrative procedure as outlined in the legislation and as explained contradictorily in the debate leaves any real understanding of it about as clear as a flea in a London fog.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on section 2 has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Chair said "on section 2." It was my understanding that the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor said "title I." Am I incorrect?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair put the motion on section 2, which contains a title I.

Mr. GRIFFIN. So the debate is closed at 6 o'clock on section 2, but not on the remainder of title I?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. POWELL. I should like for the Clerk to repeat my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may have made another request than that, but since the other sections of this title have not been read, and since no unanimous-consent request has been made that they be considered as read, no motion could have been in order on anything except that which was read. That was section 2.

Mr. POWELL. I beg to state, Mr. Chairman, that the motion I offered was on all amendments and debate on title I, and there was no point of order raised against it.

The CHAIRMAN. There may have been a misunderstanding, but the Chair knows how he put the motion, and he knows he could not have put the other motion at that time. The other sections of that title had not been read, nor had unanimous consent been requested that they be considered as read. It does happen that section 2 contains a different title I. That is the motion which the Chairman put.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POWELL. Is it possible for the Chairman to put the motion as made?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated the motion as the Chair at that time understood it. There was no correction of the Chair's statement of the motion. The motion stands as stated. That was what the Committee voted on.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on all amendments on title I close at a quarter after 6 o'clock.

Mr. QUIE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. QUIE. The Clerk has not reached section 3 as yet. For that reason, I make the point of order that such a motion is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. Such a motion can only apply to sections as they are read.

Mr. ARENDS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ARENDS. Was the original agreement entered into to close at 6 o'clock?

The CHAIRMAN. A motion was passed to close debate on section 2 at 6 o'clock.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. QUIE. If any Member has an amendment to section 2, he will be able to offer it at this time, but there will be no debate?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. If any Member rises with an amendment to section 2, he will be able to offer it, but there will be no debate on it.

If there are no amendments to section 2, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Clause (A) of section 3(c)(4) of the Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (20 U.S.C. 238(c)(4)(A)) is amended by striking out "(is," and inserting ", but excluding funds available under title II) is,".

(b) The sentence which immediately follows clause (B) of section 4(a) of such Act

(20 U.S.C. 239(a)(B)) is amended by inserting "(exclusive of funds available under title II)" immediately after "Federal funds".

(c)(1) Such Act is further amended by inserting "TITLE III—GENERAL" above the heading for section 7, and by redesignating sections 7, 8, and 9, and references thereto, as sections 301, 302, and 303, respectively.

(2) Subsections (b) and (c) of the section of such Act redesignated as section 302 are amended by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "title I".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. (a) Paragraph (2) of the section of the Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, redesignated by section 3 of this Act as section 303, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'child', except as used in title II, means any child who is within the age limits for which the applicable State provides free public education."

(b) Paragraph (4) of such section 303 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", except that for the purposes of title II such term does not include any education provided beyond grade 12".

(c) Paragraph (5) of such section 303 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or any expenditures made from funds granted under title II of this Act or titles II or III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965".

(d)(1) Paragraph (8) of such section 303 is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "the District of Columbia,", and by inserting after "the Virgin Islands" the following: ", and for purposes of title II, such term includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(2) Sections 3(d) and 6(c) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 238(d), 241(c)) are each amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," each time that it appears.

(e) Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(11) The term 'county' means those divisions of a State utilized by the Secretary of Commerce in compiling and reporting data regarding counties.

"(12) The term 'construction' includes the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

"(13) The term 'school facilities' means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) for free public education and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvements) on which such facilities are constructed, except that such term does not include those gymnasiums and similar facilities intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(14) The term 'equipment' includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, and includes all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of educational services, including items such as instructional equipment and necessary furniture, printed, published, and audio-visual instructional materials, and books, periodicals, documents, and other related materials.

"(15) For the purpose of title II, the term 'elementary school' means a day or residential school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law, and the term 'secondary school' means a day or residential school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen from Minnesota yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee, after our conversation of awhile ago that he intended to rise at 6 o'clock, if that is still his position.

Mr. POWELL. Not now. No.

Mr. ARENDS. Does the gentleman expect to come in early tomorrow?

Mr. POWELL. I hope to come in early.

Mr. ARENDS. It would be well for the gentleman to stay with his word to quit at 6 o'clock tonight rather than coming in tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. POWELL. We will finish up in about 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], the chairman of the subcommittee, a question.

On page 91, lines 15 through 23, we have the definition of the word "equipment." Would it be possible, if a local public educational agency desired to do so in order to provide special education arrangements for the educationally deprived children of private schools, to build structures to house the equipment which they loan them, of course, the title to that structure remaining in the public educational agency but the structure being constructed on the grounds of a private school.

Mr. PERKINS. The question, I feel, is answered on page 91, lines 8 to 14; and on page 79, subsection (3) where it says:

that the local educational agency has provided satisfactory assurance that the control of funds provided under this title, and title to property derived therefrom, shall be in a public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this title, and that a public agency will administer such funds and property;

The answer is "No."

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman just explained it and the conclusion was that the answer was "Yes" and now he says "No."

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman well knows that if a local public school agency is to retain title to real property it cannot be constructed on private property. The question answers itself.

Mr. QUIE. It cannot be constructed on private property?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. Suppose the equipment is mobile, if there were wheels under it, such as a mobile educational laboratory.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is reiterating what we went over time and time again during this debate. The bill provides for some special educational services for the educationally deprived youngster attending nonpublic schools. That mobile equipment will still belong to the public agency.

Mr. QUIE. But the mobile equipment may be placed on private school grounds, may it not?

Mr. PERKINS. What would be wrong with that within the limits we have provided?

Mr. QUIE. I am not saying anything is wrong with it; I am asking the question.

Mr. PERKINS. The mobile equipment would still be the property of the public agency.

Mr. QUIE. That is granted. All I want the gentleman to say is "Yes" if that is the answer. Then it can be located there?

Mr. PERKINS. It would be possible, but only within those guidelines pertaining to "special services and title requirements," set forth in the report and the bill which we have gone over previously and which the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON, so carefully explained earlier in today's debate.

Mr. QUIE. We know that the title has to be in the local public agency.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me read to the gentleman what the bill requires:

Services and arrangements provided for nonpublic school students must be special as distinguished from general educational assistance * * *.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for that purpose. This has already been read into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important at least that the private schools in my congressional district know what this bill says because they are entitled, as I read this bill, to money for the children who attend their schools, who are educationally deprived; not that they be from families of incomes of less than $2,000, but that they be educationally deprived.

As was stated in the hearings, but has not been stated on the floor, mobile science laboratories are available to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on and amendments to title I, section 4, close in 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOODELL. May we have the motion of the gentleman from New York repeated?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the motion as he understood it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] moves that all debate on section 4 of title I close in 5 minutes.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 6:

EXTENSION OF TITLE I OF PUBLIC LAW 874 EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SEC. 5. Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (20 U.S.C. 237(a), 238(b), 239(a)), are each amended by striking out "1966" each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1968".

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this is the extension of the impacted aid program for a period of 2 years.

I therefore move that all debate and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this merely for the RECORD.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] whether it is proposed that further hearings will be held soon for revision of Public Law 874. I refer specifically to certain inequities that I think the gentleman knows about, the formula which makes it impossible for my city of Los Angeles at the present time to qualify for this assistance?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let me say to my distinguished colleague from California that it will be the purpose of the subcommittee to continue hearings on Federal aid to education and we would expect to resume those hearings within the next 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to thank the gentleman very much. I shall look forward to the action on this in order that the city of Los Angeles may be able to qualify for this impacted aid assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 13:

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES, TEXTBOOKS, AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 201. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a program for making grants for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools.

(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I am grieved that Members of this body did not have an opportunity to present important amendments to this bill and debate them. For the information of my colleagues and the permanent record, I ask unanimous consent that five of the seven amendments I wished to offer be set out in full at this point in the RECORD:

AMENDMENT THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Beginning with line 1 on page 71, strike out everything down through line 8 on page 78, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 202. (a) The Commissioner shall during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, make basic grants to State educational agencies in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,060,000,000; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 203. (a) From the sums appropriated for carrying out this title for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine and shall allot such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. From the remainder of such sums, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the State of families having an annual income of less than $2,000 bears to the total number of such children of such families in all the States. The number of such children of such families shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'State' shall not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for that year but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 202 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year."

Page 78, line 11, strike out "or a special incentive grant".

Page 78, line 14, strike out "such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish" and insert in lieu thereof "its certification under section 205".

Page 81, beginning in line 13, strike out "an application, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which provides satisfactory assurance" and inserting in lieu thereof "an application which certifies".

Page 82, line 22, strike out "which meets" and insert in lieu thereof "if it and the certification contained therein meet".

Page 83, line 1, strike out "(1)", and "subject to the provisions of section 208".

Page 83, beginning in line 4, strike out "tne amount which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive under this title" and insert in lieu thereof "amounts equal to amounts expended by the State in accordance with its certification under section 205, except that the amount so paid in a fiscal year may not exceed the State's allotment under section 203 for that fiscal year".

Page 83, beginning with line 11, strike out everything down through line 20.

Page 84, beginning in line 3, strike out "to the local educational agencies of the State".

Page 84, beginning with line 19, strike out everything down through line 4 on page 85.

Page 85, line 21, strike out "assurance set forth in the State plan" and insert in lieu thereof "certification contained in the application".

Redesignate sections 205, 206, and 207 (and cross references thereto) as sections 204, 205, and 206, respectively; and redesignate sections 209, 210, 211, and 212 (and cross references thereto) as sections 207, 208, 209, and 210, respectively.

Amendment to H.R. 2362 that would have been offered by Mr. GOODELL:

"On page 78, lines 14 and 15, strike out '(consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish)'."

Amendment to H.R. 2362 that would have been offered by Mr. GOODELL:

"On page 80, lines 21 and 22, strike out 'in cooperation with' and insert in lieu thereof 'after consultation with'."

Amendment to H.R. 2362 that would have been offered by Mr. GOODELL:

"On page 74, strike out everything following line 20 and insert in lieu thereof:

"'(B) equal to 6 per centum or more of the total number of all children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in such district, whichever is greater.'

"On page 75, line 5, strike out 'one hundred or more.' and insert in lieu thereof 'equal to 6 per centum or more of the total number of all children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in such county.'"

Amendment to H.R. 2362 that would have been offered by Mr. GOODELL:

"On page 82, following line 25, add the following new section and renumber the remaining sections accordingly:

"'AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"'SEC. 207. For the purpose of making payments under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,060,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.'"

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

A BILL TO MAKE THE ORANGE BLOSSOM THE NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a House joint resolution on

today to make the orange blossom the national flower. In this I am joined by the members of the Florida delegation. It is our belief and that of the people of Florida that the orange blossom would make an ideal national flower. There are many reasons. It has a continuing history dating back to earliest recorded times. It is mentioned in the Bible and in writings coming out of China in ancient history. None of this overlooks the sentimental side of the orange blossom. Beautiful and fragrant, it is the accepted bridal flower.

Seated in the family gallery today is Miss Karol Kelly of Zephyr Hills, Florida's lovely Citrus Queen of my State. She well typifies the spirit of the occasion which we observe here.

Oranges and orange blossoms have been distributed in the Capitol today through the cooperation of the Florida Citrus Commission. The delicious fruit of the orange tree already is well known to you, but it is the blossoms in particular that we want you to become acquainted with today. They are creamy white, waxen in texture, do not deteriorate quickly, and are fragrant with a heavy perfume, which is heady and yet lovely. Those of you who have been privileged to stand in the evening in an orange grove and to sniff the rich odor of the blossoms have shared a delightful privilege indeed.

After seeing our queen tasting our oranges, and smelling the fragrance of their blossoms, we trust you will approve this resolution by acclamation.

In the language and sentiment of flowers, the orange blossom is the special symbol of marriage. When we hear of a young couple planning to be married, a picture of orange blossoms flashes through our minds. It seems a bride just must have a cluster of orange blossoms tucked in her veil to hold it in position. Often the corsage which she carries is of these fragrant flowers mixed with others. Each of you can picture a bride with her bouquet of orange blossoms, slowly walking down the aisle to "Mendelssohn's Wedding March."

The orange blossom was adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida in 1909 as Florida's State flower.

The orange tree originally was native to Asia. Centuries later it was introduced into Asia Minor from whence it was taken to the warm Mediterranean regions. Having traveled west from Asia to Spain and Africa, the orange tree was carried westward again by the Spaniards to the Caribbean Islands and to Mexico at Vera Cruz where seedlings were planted in 1518.

The Spanish settled at St. Augustine, Florida, in 1565 and records indicate that sometime afterward oranges were thriving around the settlement. The Indians liked the fruit and as they ate it, traveling through the forests, they dropped some of the seeds, which soon sprouted as wild orange trees in present-day South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama.

The plantings in Vera Cruz spread to Lower California and much later, over 200 years, it found its way into California. Franciscan Father Junipero Serra brought with him to California seedlings of the orange tree, which he planted at the San Diego Mission about 1769. The first large orange grove was not planted in California until 1805 at San Gabriel Mission. Thus, we are indebted to the Spanish for the orange blossom and orange trees in the New World.

Oranges are raised in every State along our southern border—nine States all told.

After the tree has blossomed, the fruit begins to appear. Blossoms and mature fruit can be seen on the trees at the same time, a very unusual situation. When the fruit is ripe, we all know the benefits derived from eating an orange or drinking its juice. In addition to its nutrient value, it contains the important vitamins A, B, and C in large amounts, so necessary to our health.

Next to apple production, the orange comes second of all fruits raised in the United States.

With this background to the orange blossom, the Florida delegation in Congress seeks to have it designated as the national flower of the United States.

What other flower that grows in a garden can give mankind so much: Beauty, fragrance, purity, and finally a healthful fruit. Not the rose nor the daisy nor the marigold nor the carnation can give us sustenance. All do give satisfaction to our soul, whereas the orange blossom gives more—fruit.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, this date, March 25, marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. It is a date which certainly at once sparks forth the vitality of a people filled with a zest for liberty, and demonstrates again the pallid tragedy which has become the lot of millions of people behind the Iron Curtain. While the political existence of this Republic was short lived by force of Russian imperialism, it was nonetheless a historical event that expresses the undying will of Byelorussian devotion to freedom.

It is most noteworthy that the tenacity of Byelorussians on both sides of the Iron Curtain continues to nurture their fervent desire to once more bring to their homeland the freedom of government tasted but lost 47 long years ago.

I congratulate the Byelorussians on this anniversary and wish them an early return of freedom and self-government.

RESOLUTION OF THE CONVENTION OF AMERICANS OF BYELORUSSIAN DESCENT, HELD ON MARCH 21, 1965, AT THE HOTEL BILTMORE IN NEW YORK CITY FOR THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

The Byelorussians of the free world have been closely following the events in the country of their origin. By virtue of their unflagging efforts to keep in touch with their former compatriots, there emerges a picture of Byelorussians oppressed by communism but forever trying to improve their present status and to change their future for the better. Undoubtedly, they have succeeded in pushing back the darkness somewhat. Nonetheless, their aspirations to a Byelorussian statehood have so far been blocked by the incubus of a foreign ideology, placed on their country by violence.

The idea of democratic freedom and independence, which the Byelorussians have consecrated with lives, is indestructible among them. This idea was given impetus by the anti-Russian uprising of 1863; it was developed and enriched by a host of writers of the national rebirth movement, and in the years of the Byelorussian national revolution of 1917 to 1918 it reached fruition. The convention believes that national independence for Byelorussia will be realized, for the independence movement constitutes an organic part of the historical process in this century.

Democratic sovereignty, the theme of this period, was expressed by the Byelorussians through their national leader, the poet Janka Kupala (1882–1942), who wrote: "Each people should be its own master."

Sooner or later, the Byelorussian nation shall become its own master. This is its most sacred dream and yearning. The achievement of this goal is in the interest not only of Byelorussia but of the whole community of nations.

In the world of today, cowering from the specter of nuclear war, international understanding is more urgently needed than ever. The existence of the United Nations underlines this need.

Coexistence and cooperation among nations, however, will rest upon firm foundations only when each nation will speak for itself; when neighboring states or nationalities will not usurp another nation's name and economic resources, as in the case of Byelorussia, whose name is being used by Russia in its international manifestations and blackmailing.

The endeavors of Byelorussians to have the right to speak for themselves and to be their own masters constitute the essence of recent developments in Byelorussia. They become especially obvious among the younger generation of the Byelorussian intelligentsia: among writers, artists, teachers, and students. Through their voices and creative talents, the Byelorussian people are striving to rehabilitate their past, of which it was totally deprived during the years of Stalinist terror, and to promote a maximum of political and economic freedom. Taken all together, these aspirations form the core of the idea of independence and democracy as it was promulgated in the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

We, the participants of this convention for the 47th Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence, therefore solemnly resolve:

In the all-out, further struggle for free Byelorussia, to spotlight the cultural, economic, and political achievements of the Byelorussian people; to unmask before the world the political, economic, and moral enslavement of Byelorussia by Soviet Russian imperialism.

May the torch of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic of March 1918 never go out.

Long live the free democratic Byelorussia.

For the convention:

STANISLAU STANKEVICH, Ph.D.,
National President of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

ULADZIMIER NABAGIEZ, M.D.,
President of the New York Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

SIARHIEJ HUTYRCHYK,
President of the New Jersey Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

USURPATION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY BY AN ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to protest one more blatant usurpation of legislative authority by an administrative agency of our Government.

I refer to the arbitrary and unrealistic action of the Department of Labor in setting a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour for educational trainees in the Youth Corps.

It is one thing for Congress to set a minimum wage for breadwinners engaged in interstate commerce, but it is altogether a different matter for a Federal agency which does not answer to the electorate to give away that electorate's tax money to those we are trying to help provide with education and the skills necessary for earning a living.

While I was not a Member of the House when the poverty bill was being drafted, it is my understanding that it was the intent of this body to provide the necessary subsistence to enable the greatest number of our underprivileged youth to receive the highest level of basic education, plus additional skills through vocational training, and enable reentry into school.

These are worthy goals and I subscribe to them. But because of this unrealistic and typically bureaucratic edict, these goals are being thwarted at two points:

First, because the total amount to be spent on this program is set by law, any such unrealistic wage will automatically decrease the number of underprivileged youths who can participate.

Second, because this wage is in many cases higher than that provided by local industries not covered by Federal minimum wage legislation, the youngster may be earning more than his parent. This could encourage dropouts—the very thing this bill is designed to avoid.

This is only one instance among many that makes one wonder why Congress labors long and conscientiously to enact sound, constructive legislation only to see it go down the drain because of inept, bullheaded application.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT [redacted]

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 business of the American people today is education.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (H.R. 2362) is an essential step that we must take.

If we are to keep faith with our forefathers, we here today have an obligation to the younger generations, and those yet to come, to provide the opportunity for the best education possible in order that they may be properly prepared to assume positions of responsibility and leadership which will one day be theirs. The teachers in our public school systems, the elementary and secondary schools, do more than educate our children. They are, in fact, the primary guardians of our democratic heritage. Therefore, the strength of our Nation will depend in the future, as it has in the past, on the strength of our elementary and secondary schools.

No one can deny the fact that we must do everything within our power to give local school districts of limited financial resources an opportunity to provide every child—those who come from families with such limited incomes—an opportunity for a solid foundation in the basic education of skills.

It is with deep respect that I pay highest compliments to the Honorable CARL D. PERKINS, of Kentucky, chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education, of the Committee on Education and Labor, for his dedicated service and untiring efforts which resulted in our consideration of H.R. 2362.

In particular, the formula that he has proposed for financial assistance is equitable and fair and it will provide our local school districts with the essential finances which they so desperately need in order to properly fulfill their responsibilities.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that the Members of the House will pass this historic legislation exactly as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, without a single amendment.

MAPLE SIRUP RESEARCH

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, it was announced on December 31, 1964, that a research program costing $285,400 to further improve the quality and reduce the cost of producing maple sirup would be discontinued. The explanation for this decision was that the returns on the research dollar of the USDA would probably be higher in some other area. In view of the spectacular results of the past research program on maple sirup it is felt that there is no further place to go with maple sirup research.

The research financed by the USDA, costing about $1,500,000 since 1948, has indeed produced spectacular results. It can very well be said to have preserved the industry, and kept maple sirup on our tables.

Here are some of the most spectacular accomplishments:

First. The yield of sap per tree has been increased 60 to 80 percent.

Second. The flavor quality per gallon of sirup has been increased four times.

Third. The factors causing offgrade sirup have been found and eliminated.

The net effect of this research to the farmer will be, once it has been fully applied, a sixfold increase in the value of the product from his sugarbush.

In 1964, the value of maple products produced in the United States was $8 million. Production was the highest in the last 9 years, and so was the price. This means that maple products, unlike many farm products, has a very high elasticity of demand, and that if production is increased further, the effect on price will not be great. Increased production will result in increased farm income—without Government supports.

These areas of research need further work, and justify a continuation of this program:

First. Methods for storage of sap without deterioration: The unpredictability of occurrence and amount of maple sap flow often results in the production of sap quantities far in excess of the capacity of evaporating equipment. This necessitates the storage of sap for periods of 4 to 6 days and results in deterioration of the sap. Current practices permit satisfactory storage for a maximum of 24 hours. Methods should be developed to provide for the delivery of sterile sap to the evaporation storage facilities. Better methods of sap handling and sanitation in the woods, in transit, and in plant storage tanks are needed.

Second. Expansion of studies already initiated on the adapting of food processing plant equipment and modifying sirup making procedures: This work should be expanded so that more food processing plants can be converted to maple sirup production during their idle period. This was recommended by the Forestry Research Advisory Committee at their meeting in November 1964.

Third. Improvement in the efficiency of sap evaporating equipment: The cost of evaporating maple sap to sirup is one of the major items in maple sirup production. A further lowering of evaporation costs is essential to the lowering of the price of sirup.

Fourth. Identification of the flavor potentiator in maple sirup: Preliminary studies have indicated the presence of a flavor potentiator in maple sirup. Work should be initiated to [redacted] its nature and identity. The production of this food potentiator could provide new and expanded outlets for maple sirup.

Fifth. Studies on the nature and properties of maple flavor precursors: This will provide information necessary for further improving sirup manufacturing methods. The identity of the precursors of maple flavor and tests for identifying them would be of great value to the Forest Service in their selection and propagation of maple trees for maple sirup production.

Sixth. Methods are needed for the culturing, stocking, and commercial distribution of cultures of organisms required

for the development of enhanced maple flavor by controlled fermentation.

Seventh. Methods to prevent the formation of sugar sand in sirup: Methods need to be developed that will remove the formative agents of sugar sand from sap or sirup. This could be done by use of a chelating agent to be added to the sap or sirup or by ion exchange techniques. In either case the treatment must in no way affect the maple flavor.

In the middle of February, in Michigan, we begin to get our first thaws. The sun, on a clear day, begins to give its warmth to us again. The rough black bark of the sugar maple absorbs the heat of the sun's rays, and on the south side of the trees the sap begins to stir. This is the time we tap the tree, and join in the resurgence of life as winter begins to melt away. The trees give of their mellowed sweetness through the month of March, until their buds are swollen and their flowers burst into bloom, throwing their pollen to the bees and to the winds.

I hope we may continue to help these hardy men who love their maples to learn more about them, so that the bounty which they give us will continue to increase. I trust the Department of Agriculture will reconsider its decision.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 43, I was recorded as not voting.

Due to my attendance at a meeting in my district relative to the preservation of the Ansley Wilcox House as a national historic site, I was delayed in returning to Washington. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea."

BASIN AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a number of us who serve on the Committee on Public Works have joined today in introducing a bill to provide a 1-year extension on basin authorizations for 10 basins in the country which face the situation in which the authorizations will be exhausted in the very near future and appropriation requests therefore would be imperiled.

We wish to make it very clear that this basin authorization bill which is being introduced is not intended in any way to be a substitute for an omnibus bill or to delay in any way an omnibus bill, because it is my understanding that the Committee on Public Works does intend to proceed with hearings on new projects under an omnibus bill in the very near future.

We invite those who are in the basins affected by this legislation introduced today to join us in seeking the quickest possible consideration and approval of this legislation.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to join in the introduction of this legislation. It is absolutely essential at this time. I trust Congress will take immediate action.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY THROUGH EDUCATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, having been assured by a high authority that H.R. 2362 would be brought to some conclusive action today, I confirmed longstanding arrangements to participate in the wedding ceremony of my daughter, Virginia, to Dr. James Mount. The wedding is taking place in Akron, Ohio.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported all of the truly constructive educational bills that have been introduced in Congress. As my remarks of yesterday must indicate, I cannot support H.R. 2362, as it has been presented.

Early this March, I requested the House Rules Committee to withhold action on this bill until my educational bill, H.R. 6349, could be considered. This bill was also introduced by Representatives CURTIS and GOODELL. I would call your attention that one title of this bill is identical to that introduced by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

It is unfortunate that the House is not to have the opportunity to vote on this legislation. H.R. 6349 would certainly bring about equality of opportunity through education—however, the Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has advised me that this bill would not be germane to H.R. 2362, as a substitute.

Meetings with the minority assure me that the plans for the corrections of the many inequalities of H.R. 2362 are in most capable hands. The very Members who shall offer amendments and opposing action on H.R. 2362 are the very same Members who have so ably added corrective amendments to other legislative matters that have successfully been enacted into law.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEETING OF GRANT AND LEE AT APPOMATTOX

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Friday, April 9, is the 100th anniversary of one of the most important dates in the history of our Nation. One hundred years ago on that day, Gen. Robert E. Lee and Gen. Ulysses S. Grant met at the conference table at Appomattox, Va., and negotiated peace terms between the North and the South. I know of no event of more importance to our Nation since our Constitution was adopted. It represented the uniting of a war-torn nation, the healing of a breach, the welding together of a great people, the rebirth of a nation.

There will be conducted at the Appomattox Court House National Historical Park commemorative services honoring these two great men, Generals Lee and Grant, as well as the peace that was achieved that day 100 years ago. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, a grandson of General Grant, and Robert E. Lee IV, a great-grandson of General Lee, will take part in the ceremony dedicating the restoration of the old court house where the Confederate soldiers were mustered out after the peace terms had been agreed upon. Mr. Bruce Catton, the author of "A Stillness at Appomattox," a noted scholar, and Pulitzer Prize winner as well as a great historian, will deliver the address. The Marine Band from Quantico will provide the music. The Governor of Virginia and many other notables will be present.

On behalf of the people of Appomattox in particular and Virginia in general, I extend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives a cordial invitation to attend these exercises as our guests and to visit this great shrine which stands as an emblem of peace between our people and in memory of those great warriors who fought, bled, and died for principles they believed in and were willing to sacrifice their all in defense of same.

THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON NAZI WAR CRIMINALS AND GERMANY'S RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us are gratified today by the news that the West German Parliament has extended the statute of limitations on the prosecution of Nazi war criminals until 1970. I know that all of the members of the Jewish community recognize this as a further demonstration of responsibility on the part of the West German Government.

We are equally pleased at the imminent prospect of an exchange of ambassadors between West Germany and Israel.

The West German authorities are to be highly congratulated for their response to the dictatorial demands of President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. This courageous action deserves tribute from all of us who have supported the cause of the State of Israel.

These actions—the recognition of Israel and the extension of the statute of limitations—are in stark contrast to the position taken by the Soviet puppet government in East Germany. That Government has done everything possible during the past 20 years to create chaos in Europe. From the Berlin airlift to the Berlin wall, East Germany has demonstrated the lack of interest of its Soviet masters in securing peace in Germany or for that matter anywhere in the world.

Concomitantly, East Germany has done nothing whatever to atone for Germany's crimes during the Second World War. No Nazis are being tried or traced behind the Iron Curtain. Little or no cooperation in making records of the Nazis period available has been received from the Soviets or their satellites. No restitution has been made to the Jewish victims of nazism from them. No help has come to Israel from them.

What has come from behind the Berlin wall? A pledge of $100 million to assist President Nasser of Egypt.

Israel is the only existing democracy in the Middle East. All believers in freedom throughout the world welcome the actions of both Israelis and Germans in demonstrating to the free world that morality is a function of government and that blackmail must be resisted.

We commend all freedom-loving people everywhere who joined in the effort to convince the Federal Republic of Germany to act as properly as it has.

We salute the high-minded officials of that Government for once more standing up for the right.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE: A TRIBUTE

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to the Byelorussians, a people who have been cursed by the misfortunes of geographic determinism; for there is no doubt that if their country had not been situated within the shadows of great Russian power, Byelorussia would probably be an independent nation-state today.

Geographic determinism is a principle in politics that can work to the advantage or disadvantage of nation-states. We Americans were singularly blessed by the geographic fact that during our formative years we were isolated by and large from the incessant political struggles that plagued modern European states. And when we were sufficiently strong, we were able to make our entry onto the world political scene with more than a reasonable assurance of success.

But, nations like Byelorussia have never enjoyed the benefits of geography. Caught up in the crossfire of the Teutonic-Slavic struggle, they never had the choice to achieve their national aspirations in an atmosphere of political serenity. In fact the only respite they enjoyed as a nation came with the dissolution of Russian power and at that time they declared their independence. But with the reemergence of Russian power in the form of Soviet communism, Byelorussian independence was doomed.

On this day of national dedication we join with freemen the world over in renewing our pledge to the universal hope of self-determination of all peoples.

MARYLAND DAY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Maryland Day, 1965, marks the 331st anniversary of the founding of the colony that has become one of the great States of the Union. In the course of 331 years Maryland has given the Nation and the world many concepts that are now basic principles of modern thinking. Religious toleration and the right of women to participate in political activity were, for example, both asserted in 17th-century Maryland.

In 1965 we shall mark the bicentennial of an event in Maryland history that has few parallels in its importance to all of America. A tax to be raised through stamps required for legal documents was imposed on the American colonies by the British Parliament in 1764. As most taxes are, the stamp tax was unpopularly received, but in addition it raised the constitutional questions of "taxation without representation" and the extent of the legislative powers of the Parliament at Westminster over the colonies of British America. Discontent was expressed through the organization of the "Sons of Liberty" and the adoption of resolutions of protest.

In Maryland the reaction to the Stamp Act was rational, forceful, and highly significant. The greatest patriot interest in the colony was expressed in Frederick County, the mother county of western Maryland, whose boundaries then included all that now comprises Montgomery, Washington, Allegany, and Garrett Counties and much of Carroll County. The 12 judges of Frederick County rendered an opinion that the court should proceed with its business without the controversial revenue stamps, and it so ordered its clerk. This action won immediate and vigorous approval. The dean of Maryland historians, James McSherry, in assessing the importance of the judicial action said the "Frederick County court had the high honor of first deciding, in a legal manner, the unconstitutionality of the Stamp Act."

McSherry further reports:

This decision was received with joy; and the people hastened to celebrate so important and significant an event. The festival took place in Frederick, on the 30th of November, 1765. The "Sons of Liberty," in funeral procession, in honor of the death of the Stamp Act, marched through the streets, bearing a coffin, on which was inscribed: "The Stamp Act, expired of a mortal stab received from the Genius of Liberty, in Frederick County Court, 23d November, 1765, aged 22 days." Zachariah Hood, the late unfortunate stamp distributor, was chief mourner, in effigy, and the whole affair ended merrily in a ball.

Mathew Page Andrews in his "History of Maryland" adds some interesting details in describing the repudiation:

On December 10, in a supplement entitled "an apparition of the late Maryland Gazette," the editor announced that the magistrates of Frederick County had resolved that business should go on without stamps, on the plea that the Stamp Act had not "been legally transmitted to them." This decision of the magistrates was celebrated in Frederick Town by an elaborate pageant or public parade. Such proceedings served to attract popular attention to the principles under discussion. On this occasion, pursuant upon the colors, drums, and a banner proclaiming the independent action of the magistrates, there came inscriptions such as "Magna Carta," "Charter of Maryland," "Trials by Juries Restored," "Oppression Removed," "Liberty and Loyalty." Finally, there appeared a coffin with the legend: The Stamp Act, expired of a mortal stab received from the Genius of Liberty in Frederick County Court, 23d November, 1765—aged 22 days.

Charles Albro Barker, in "The Background of the Revolution in Maryland" calls the court's order the "first sign" of resistance:

The first sign that the colony would disregard the tax came from Frederick County, in November. The county judges decided that, since they had never received official notice of the Stamp Act, they would proceed with the regular business of the court, as if they had no reason to believe that special circumstances existed. The decision was celebrated in a fitting manner. Self-styled "Sons of Liberty" of Frederick town honored the judges with a ball and many patriotic toasts. They buried the Stamp Act in a mock funeral, where the only mourner was an effigy of Zachariah Hood.

The political consequences of the ferment that arose because of the stamp tax are probably unequaled in all history. The constitutional principles of representative government and political self-determination which were to justify the revolution in the next decade were made household words throughout America by the intense interest aroused by the Stamp Act.

A less recognized aspect of the action of the Frederick County court was the impact upon judicial as well as political precedents. Although the court adopted a lawyers' pretext for its action, there is no doubt from contemporary reaction and from all the surrounding circumstances that the court fully understood and appreciated the importance of its decision in repudiating the Stamp Act. McSherry is right in saying that the court labeled it "unconstitutional," and not worthy of obedience.

Thus we find jurists in America even before the foundation of the Republic who had the courage to be independent of

the power that elevated them to the bench. The Frederick County court, a remote tribunal in a distant province placed so great an importance on "liberty" that it struck down the decree of an imperial parliament, and reinforced the power of courts to protect the rights of a people even against its own rulers.

The repudiation decision is, therefore, a great judicial precedent in America and one of the important steps toward the establishment of our State and Federal system of judges independent of either executive or legislative control.

The court was justly revered in its own day and has been given recognition for all of these two centuries. In 1894 the General Assembly of Maryland declared that November 23 should be a legal holiday in Frederick County. In 1904 a memorial to the immortal judges was erected in the present Frederick County Courthouse. It is important to remember each of them: Joseph Smith, Samuel Beall, Thomas Price, William Luckett, David Lynn, Joseph Beall, Andrew Heugh, James Dickson, Charles Jones, Peter Bainbridge, William Blair, and Thomas Beatty.

Today I have introduced a resolution calling upon the President of the United States to proclaim November 23, 1965, as Repudiation Day in recognition of the great significance of the action of the Frederick County court as a preamble to the American Revolution, and to further bear witness to the importance that we still place upon a judiciary that has the courage to be independent and the wisdom and strength to protect the liberties of the people against every sort of tyranny.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to believe our remarks in this Chamber today will affect in any way the independence and the freedom of the millions of Byelorussians, who 47 years after they declared their independence from czarist Russia, continue to live their lives under another kind of Russian imperialism. In recalling this anniversary date, perhaps we can accomplish two things: One, in some way let the Byelorussian people know that Americans do not for one moment believe that Byelorussian incorporation into the U.S.S.R. was a free and independent act on the part of the Byelorussian peoples; and two, to remind ourselves that our freedom and independence is a cherished goal denied to millions who live behind the iron curtain.

A brief review of the history of the Byelorussian people may give a renewed meaning to our own freedoms. Although the Byelorussians were a defined cultural and social group as early as the 10th century, their subjugation to Russia began in the 15th century when their country was overrun by the "barbaric Muscovite hordes." For more than the next 300 years, the Byelorussians were completely oppressed by czarist Russia. One would think that after 300 years the people would have lost all of their national feeling and unity, but this was not the case, for when czarist Russia fell to the Communists in the Russian Revolution of 1917, these people declared their independence March 25, 1918—just 47 years ago. At the time the Byelorussian National Republic was proclaimed the country was occupied by the Germans, but when the Germans left, the Communists moved in, and early in 1921, just about 3 years after independence, the Red Army occupied the country and independence came to an end. Since the 15th century, except for 3 years, the Byelorussians have lived under Russian rule.

Although we cannot give the Byelorussian people their independence, we can give them the best wishes of the American people as they remember a happy date in their history—47 years ago.

PROPOSED PUBLIC RECORDS LAW

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today for consideration by the House of Representatives a bill designed to give the public greater access to information about activities of the Federal Government.

The bill's objective is to prevent the unnecessary suppression or manipulation of public information by Federal agencies. Some Government agencies have lost sight of the fact that they exist to serve the people, and have come to feel as though they themselves have the sole responsibility to determine what the public should and should not know about the Government.

This bill would require that every Federal agency make all its records promptly available to any citizen and would give the courts power to order records made public when they are improperly withheld. It includes several specific exceptions.

The bill would establish guidelines and procedures which should make it easier to get information out of the Federal Government. In this connection, I want to commend the work of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee for its work.

Because of the substantial support for the subcommittee's activities under Chairman JOHN E. MOSS, I am encouraged that we can obtain action on a good bill this year.

Enactment of a public records law would be a positive statement that Congress intends to make public all records of the executive branch of Government with but a few exceptions.

In the 18-year history of the public information section of the Administrative Procedure Act, events have shown that instead of providing for more expeditious release of public information, it actually serves as a vehicle by which agencies can withhold information from the public.

The existing law needlessly provides opportunities for secrecy-minded Government officials to ignore the stated congressional intent that agencies "take the initiative in informing the public."

The law mentions "secrecy in the public interest" fails to define the meaning of "public interest." Each agency is permitted to draw up its own definition.

The existing law provides for withholding of information relating to the "internal management of an agency," but this has permitted secrecy regarding matters such as budget procedures.

The Hoover Commission Task Force on Legal Services and Procedure reported that under the "internal management" exemption, "hundreds of interpretive regulations contained in the claims manual of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, were not published nor otherwise made available to the public; these were the very same rules which governed the settlement of more than 2 million claims a year."

Under existing law, if a Government agency can find no other basis for withholding information, it can resort to the vague and all-encompassing concept that the information be held "confidential for good cause found."

As a result of these problems, Government agencies have been able to withhold substantial amounts of information from the public, and I want to submit, Mr. Speaker, that this situation, together with the generally expanding centralized authority in the Federal Government, constitutes a real threat to the continued strength of our democratic system of government.

Excessive control of information about a government always accompanies the assumption of excessive power by that government, and the survival of our representative system depends on a continuing public access to information about the Government.

The proposed bill would require that a Federal agency would have to prove its right to withhold specific records. Persons seeking Government information could file suit in a U.S. district court which would have the authority to order the production of agency records improperly withheld and would have the power to punish agency officials for contempt if they refused to disclose the records.

Federal Government records which would be exempted from the disclosure requirements would include national defense and foreign policy secrets specifically protected by Executive order, documents relating to internal personnel rules and practices of an agency, privileged trade secrets, agency memoranda

dealing solely with matters of law or policy, personnel and medical files, investigatory files compiled for law enforcement, and certain reports used by agencies responsible for regulation of financial institutions.

Activities and decisions of the Federal Government should be open to full scrutiny of citizens. But too often we are confronted with bureaucrats who seem determined to keep the business of Government under a rug of secrecy.

The management of news has become an accepted procedure in almost every departmental office, from top to bottom, in the administration.

A public records law is badly needed so that citizens will be better able to determine whether Federal agencies are acting in ways which are responsive to the needs and wishes of the people.

EDUCATION

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, although I have spent over one-half of my life in the field of politics, I consider still that my profession is teaching. I began my teaching career in a one-room school with all eight grades at Opperman, Ohio. I taught in a junior high school in Cambridge, Ohio. I was principal of the high school for 4½ years in my home town of Senecaville, Ohio. I resigned in January 1931, to serve in the Ohio State Legislature. I was superintendent of schools at Murray City, Ohio, when I was elected to Congress in 1932. I resigned the first of March in 1933 to take my seat in Congress. I realized then, as I do now, that the hope of my country rests upon the character and education of the young people who, generation after generation, assume the burdens and the privileges of citizenship in our Republic.

Education has made great strides since I taught my last class in school. In spite of this progress, the incentive and the opportunity for education is seriously lacking in our country. In spite of all the money spent by local taxpayers and States, 8 million adults in the United States have completed less than 5 years of school. School dropouts are setting an all-time record which primarily accounts for the fact that 20 percent of all young people between the ages of 18 and 24 years, are unemployed. When we compare this figure with the national average of unemployment, somewhere near 5 percent, we can only conclude that something more is needed. The population explosion has crowded our schools to the point where individual attention to a pupil such as I received as a student and gave as a teacher, is no longer possible. It is shocking to note that of all young men called up under the Selective Service System, 21.6 percent were rejected because they could not pass the fairly simple mental tests uniformly given throughout the country.

The burden of building new schools and operating them has raised real estate taxes to the point where the property owner cannot be expected to assume greater and greater burdens. Federal aid to primary and secondary education has long been discussed by educators and nearly every interested group in our Nation.

Two things have been uppermost in the minds of all our citizens. The first is the fear that the Federal Government would attempt to control education in the local school districts. Under H.R. 2362, all funds will be distributed through each State to local school authorities, who will determine what use will be made of all Federal funds. I am convinced that the Federal Government, through this bill, will have no more control over the operation of local schools than they have had under the vocational education program which has been in existence for many decades. The use to which Federal funds will be applied will be determined solely by the school authorities in each State and each local school district. I see no possible way under this bill where the business of education can, in any way, be shifted from "back home" to Washington.

The second thing that has worried many people in connection with Federal aid to primary and secondary schools, is the long-established principle in our country that church and state should be separate as was envisioned and declared by the framers of our Constitution. After a study of the hearings and the bill itself, I am convinced that this principle will not be violated.

In the first place, the bill authorizes no funds for the payment of private school teachers. Neither does it provide for the purchase of materials or the construction of facilities for private schools. The most it provides is that educationally deprived children in nonpublic schools, under approval and absolute control of the local public school agency, may attend dual enrollment classes and take advantage of educational radio and television programs and other educational media centers. The local public school authorities may adopt certain instructional offerings in which any student may participate.

In a letter received this week from Andrew J. Biemiller, director, department of legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, he states:

> For too many years, the church-state issue has made it impossible to obtain such legislation. We are extremely pleased, therefore, to see that the bill now coming before the House is being supported by important organizations representing all major religious denominations. It is our conviction, along with these organizations, that the present bill raises no constitutional problems.
>
> The AFL–CIO urges you, therefore, to vote for H.R. 2362 without amendment so that this program can be placed into effect at the earliest opportunity.

Under this bill, grants to local school districts in Ohio would amount to $36,708,699. To improve school libraries, et cetera, Ohio would receive $5,406,689. For supplemental education, Ohio would receive $4,912,452. For improvement of the State Department of Education, Ohio would receive $964,737.

In addition, the education leaders of Ohio, speaking for the public school groups they represent, unqualifiedly and specifically endorse H.R. 2362, which provides Federal aid to primary and secondary schools in our Nation. I have received the following telegrams urging me to support this legislation:

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Educational poverty is a problem which Ohio is not recognizing. High teacher-pupil ratios in our classrooms in Ohio are making it impossible to provide individual attention to thousands of children. There are additional educational objectives contained in H.R. 2362, which will enrich Ohio's educational program. The teachers in Ohio strongly request your support of H.R. 2362, as recommended by the House Labor and Education Committee.

CHARLES W. COOK,
President, Ohio Department of Classroom Teachers.
LORAIN, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The education of the children of America for the space age will necessitate a cooperative effort of local, State and National financial resources. Ohio's 2 million children will benefit measurable by passage of H.R. 2362. I urge your support of this bill as now written by voting favorably on the floor of the House.

ROBERT DOWLING,
President, Ohio Education Association.
ALLIANCE, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Two million children need your support in upgrading elementary and secondary education in the State of Ohio. H.R. 2362 will supplement State and local financial contributions to the children of Ohio to the extent of over $35 million. We have studied H.R. 2362, and are satisfied that it is a bill for students. We encourage your support. Resist all efforts to amend or recommit this legislation.

THOMAS QUICK,
President, Ohio Association of School Administrators.
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Ohio high school principals believe education needs of Ohio's 2 million schoolchildren demand passage of H.R. 2362. Additional $35 million applied to education in Ohio will definitely provide more adequate program. Your help in securing immediate enactment of H.R. 2362 will serve best interest of Ohio and Nation.

ROBERT D. REGULA,
President, Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals.
FREMONT, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your good services toward passage of H.R. 2362. We work very close to the schoolchildren of Ohio and we know that their educational programs require the financial aid for improvements provided by the

Education Act of 1965. Please seek quick enactment without amendment.

JAMES C. KING,
President, Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals.
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our association urges passage of H.R. 2362. Ohio needs this aid for education.

RALPH H. WOODIN,
Executive Secretary, Ohio Vocational Association.
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Representative ROBERT T. SECREST,
Washington, D.C.:

H.R. 2362 is a bill Ohio needs to provide more educational opportunity for our children. The bill has sound economic value in that an educated people is essential to job security or attainment. Welfare will require fewer dollars with an educated people. Teaching children to read and write through remedial education programs and providing more individual teacher assistance is a primary goal of H.R. 2362. Your favorable vote will assure greater educational opportunity for the educationally disadvantaged.

THOMAS O'KEEFE,
Executive Secretary, Ohio Education Association.
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The 1,000 members of the Ohio School Counselors Association urge you to support H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

W. R. DRURY,
President, Ohio School Counselors Association.
XENIA, OHIO.

Every one of these educators represent the teachers of Ohio. These teachers are dedicated men and women who do the best they can with the material they have, and I am convinced this bill will give them better materials with which to perform their work as educators.

The late Senator Robert Taft, with whom I served in the Ohio State Legislature in 1931, said:

Education is primarily a State function, but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States.

One of the outstanding programs in Ohio is Buckeye Girls State, sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary of the Department of Ohio. In the foreword to their brochure text is the following:

Government in Ohio is a highly specialized business of tremendous proportions which furnishes essential services at appreciable costs. Only thorough basic understanding of the American system and by reasonable information on public affairs can the individual citizen, who must pay his share of that cost, hope to safeguard valued American institutions and elevate the standard of public service. A thriving democracy depends on an informed and ever-vigilant citizenry.

I was the author of the bill passed by Congress in the mid-1930's to celebrate the Ordinance of 1787 and the settlement of the Northwest Territory. Nearly every community in Ohio had a fitting and memorable celebration of this great document. The Ordinance of 1787 provided "that schools and means of education should forever be encouraged in the Northwest Territory." In my opinion, this bill, H.R. 2362, is another step forward in education consistent with the Ordinance of 1787 and the spirit of our National Constitution.

The facts convince me that this is a good bill and I intend to support it. In the first place, the need for better education has been clearly demonstrated. In the second place, the homeowner and the businessman has been taxed in many districts beyond reason in an effort to provide an education for the children of our country. In the third place, I am convinced that this bill will still leave complete control in the hands of public State, county, and local school boards. In the fourth place, I am convinced that the constitutional principle of separation of church and state is not violated by this proposed legislation.

Education is not a matter of party. It is the lifeblood of this Republic. As one who believes that teaching, next to the clergy, is the most essential of all professions, I support and will vote for this bill to further education of a new generation upon which the future of our Republic must rest.

NEW YORK PUERTO RICAN COMMUNITY URGES CONGRESS TO ABOLISH LITERACY TESTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary is conducting hearings on the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (H.R. 6400). Yesterday I testified before the committee and recommended a number of amendments to strengthen the bill so that it would reach every barrier to the franchise. I urged the committee to abolish completely the literacy test which has been used to disenfranchise American citizens in both the South and the North. I have introduced H.R. 2477 to outlaw literacy tests. I pointed out that the literacy test in New York State prevents many Spanish-speaking citizens from registering to vote. In equity and justice Congress should abolish it.

Today the Honorable Herman Badillo, Commissioner of Relocation of the City of New York, vice president of the Legion of Voters, Inc., and a member of the National Association of Puerto Rican Civil Rights, testified before the Committee on the Judiciary. He was accompanied by Mrs. Irma Santaella, Deputy Commissioner of Correction of the City of New York and president of the Legion of Voters, Inc.; Gilbert Gerena Valentin, president of the National Association of Puerto Rican Civil Rights; Jose Morales, secretary of the National Association of Puerto Rican Civil Rights; and a large delegation of representatives of organizations active in the Puerto Rican community of New York who came to Washington to express the determination of the Puerto Rican community to achieve full equality at the ballot box. As American citizens, they were petitioning their Government for a redress of grievances in the time-honored American tradition, and they are to be commended for their leadership in the struggle for freedom.

After the hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary, Commissioner Badillo, Commissioner Santaella, Gilbert Gerena Valentin, and Jose Morales went to the White House to present the testimony for President Johnson.

In his testimony Commissioner Badillo estimated that there are some 330,000 Puerto Ricans of voting age in New York City who have not enjoyed the right to vote because of the literacy test. He said, "We are then, American citizens, proud of our heritage, proud of our contribution to the general welfare of our Nation, and stand ready to contribute to our Nation's defense against any and all enemies." And he asked Congress to "take action to do away with the literacy test." I strongly urge my colleagues to heed his words and include the full text of his eloquent testimony at this point in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF HERMAN BADILLO BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, WITH RESPECT TO VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965, A BILL TO ENFORCE THE 15TH AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 25, 1965

My name is Herman Badillo. I am here as vice president of the Legion of Voters, Inc., of which Mrs. Irma Vidal Santaella, who is here with me, is president and as a member of the National Association of Puerto Rican Civil Rights of which Mr. Gerena Valentin, who is here with me, is president. We are all here with a delegation of representatives from scores of organizations which are active in the Puerto Rican community of New York City and New York State. We are here to speak on behalf of more than 750,000 Puerto Ricans who are residents of New York State and who are being denied the right to vote by means of the requirement of literacy test in the State of New York as well as by other devices. Of course, much of what we have to say applies with equal force to Negro citizens in New York State who are also denied the right to vote by the same means. But I will speak here today with particular reference to the Puerto Rican community since this is the community that we belong to, that we have experience with, and that we are in a position to represent.

At the outset I would like to commend President Johnson for his magnificent message on Monday, March 15, with respect to voting rights. Those of us who were watching him on television were electrified when he urged local governments to "open your polling places to all people, allow men and women to register and vote whatever the color of their skin. Extend the rights of citizenship to every citizen of this land." This is precisely what we have come here to ask for.

We have come to the Congress of the United States to urge that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 be extended to guarantee Puerto Ricans and other citizens of the State of New York the right to vote by eliminating what we consider a grossly unjust and undemocratic barrier to the right to vote—the literacy test.

Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States and have been so for close to 50

years. In the last three decades we have joined the millions of Americans throughout the land who have migrated to new communities in search of better opportunities.

We have settled in more than 100 communities throughout the United States, where we today, number approximately 1 million persons. We have come from a vigorous and dynamic island that has in the last 20 years transformed itself from a once poor land into one of the fastest developing areas of the world. Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico are today a major bridge between the two great cultures of the Americas. Ours is a society that has blended a rich Hispanic heritage with a system of government familiar to all Americans for, as you know, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is molded in the same pattern as the Federal Government and the States of the Union.

We are very active participants in our government, keenly aware of our rights and responsibilities as citizens both of the Commonwealth, and of the United States.

We have demonstrated our responsibilities as citizens in many ways, not the least of which has been in the defense of our Nation. We have served and shed blood in World Wars and Korea. It is interesting to note in this regard that service in the Armed Forces is not limited to Americans literate in English for Americans of any and all linguistic backgrounds are called to serve the Nation in time of need.

In the Korean conflict where 91.2 percent of the Puerto Rican participants were volunteers, 1 of every 42 casualties suffered by U.S. troops was a Puerto Rican.

Puerto Rico suffered 1 casualty for every 660 inhabitants of the Commonwealth as opposed to 1 casualty for every 1,125 inhabitants of the Continental United States.

We are then, American citizens, proud of our heritage, proud of our contribution to the general welfare of our Nation, and stand ready to contribute to our Nation's defense against any and all enemies.

In the State of New York today, according to estimates made by the migration division of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor, we number some 750,000 persons. The greater bulk of the Puerto Rican community resides in the city of New York with smaller populations in Rochester, Buffalo and other communities.

Of the 730,000 Puerto Ricans in the city of New York, approximately 250,000 are of less than voting age. We have calculated that out of a total of more than 480,000 potential voters, there are today 150,000 Puerto Ricans registered to vote. In other words, some 330,000 Puerto Ricans are eligible to vote but have not been able to avail themselves of this, the fundamental right of American citizens.

We submit to you that it is the literacy test which deprives this very substantial number of citizens of their voting rights in New York State very much in the same way as literacy tests do in other States of the Union.

One has only to examine the history of literacy tests to see this more clearly. As President Johnson noted in his recent message to the Congress on voting, "the first literacy tests were legislated in Northern States in an effort to exclude immigrants—especially Irish—from the franchise."

Bigotry and race superiority were clearly evident in the 1915 New York Constitutional Convention debate on literacy tests when a prominent delegate to the convention stated: "Gentlemen, we must stop to think of what we are. This is not a question of nations, it is a question of races, and when all is said and done there is not a man in this room who dares deny that we are an English race, born and bred and brought up with the traditions of the men of England; of Anglo-Saxon stock."

One of the most vigorous opponents of literacy tests during that convention was Robert F. Wagner, Sr., father of Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York. Mayor Wagner, I may point out, is as energetically opposed to literacy tests as was his distinguished father. Our mayor has indeed been a champion in our cause both in New York City and in the State.

Mayor Wagner's father at the convention in 1915 in an eloquent appeal to the delegates said, "Can you not recognize in the amendment a clandestine effort to prevent (the) assimilation of alien blood into our citizenship and to segregate and exclude the foreigner from the rights, the privileges, and the opportunities which we have always held out to all men? Literacy is not a test of character or personal fitness but of opportunity. In other words he's being penalized for not having had the opportunity to get schooling."

There exists then a myth in our State of New York that a citizen can be an intelligent, well-informed voter only if he is literate in English. We differ with that view very emphatically.

When any New Yorker opens a newspaper in the subway to read about Dr. Martin Luther King in Selma or President Johnson in Johnson City you can be certain that his neighbor, reading a Spanish-language newspaper is reading the same news—not only that, but his cousin riding a bus to work in San Juan is also doing precisely the same. It is highly probable that the story was written by the same reporter, since the wire services that serve the New York English-language newspapers also serve newspapers in Puerto Rico and Latin America. The same is true about columnists—the same Drew Pearson who is syndicated in newspapers throughout the land also writes for a Spanish-language newspaper in New York where his column is called "Tio Vivo" instead of Washington Merry-Go-Round.

The folks in New York who read the Spanish-language daily press, the weeklies, magazines, view Spanish-language newsreels and listen to the half dozen Spanish-language radio programs, are as well informed about the world around them as any of their neighbors, for the news they read or listen to has to do with city hall, Albany, Washington, San Juan, Moscow, or Saigon.

Puerto Ricans in the State and city of New York, however, are increasingly bilingual. Tens of thousands have over the years availed themselves of the free English-language instruction program offered in New York and other communities.

Yet we submit once again that whether a Puerto Rican does or does not write in English should not and must not affect his right to vote.

As one eminent observer has put it, "The vote was never intended to serve as a means of coercing people to learn English."

Gentlemen we pay taxes to support our city, State, and Federal Government; when asked to serve our country in time of war we are never asked to take a literacy test; we perform all the obligations of citizens; yet many of us are denied the most important right—the right to join with our neighbors to choose who will represent us. We seek relief from this injustice.

We point out, however, that it is not only the existence of literacy test requirements that concern the Puerto Rican community in New York State. There are numerous Puerto Ricans who are eligible to become voters who could pass the literacy test. We are concerned because every year many thousands of citizens who attempt to take the test and to register and who qualify for doing so, are prevented from exercising their right to vote by techniques which are designed to impede and obstruct the registration process.

President Johnson stated in his speech "the Negro citizen may go to register only to be told that the day is wrong, the hour is late or the officer in charge is absent." This same kind of pattern is repeated in the local registration in New York City, year after year. Literacy test certificates suddenly disappear so that it takes 2½ hours or maybe all day by the time a new supply is received from the central office of the board of education. Pencils and other supplies are found to be lacking and I can say from experience that I have had to buy pencils from a local candy store in order that people on line could go in and take the literacy test. Polling places and registration places are closed before the time scheduled by law, and I can say from experience that in the year 1960 when I was cochairman of the late President Kennedy's campaign in East Harlem I proved before the county board of elections that 14 Puerto Ricans, some of whom had waited as long as 5 or 6 hours to register, were turned away because a local school was closed one-half hour before the time to register had expired.

These 14 Puerto Ricans whose story was reported in the New York City newspapers, were representative of many of the others who were on line who could not afford to take the time off from work in order to spend a whole day at the board of elections. They were also representative of the many thousands of others throughout the city of New York who were similarly disenfranchised.

I can testify from personal experience last year in New York City during a local firehouse registration campaign that there were waiting periods of up to 6 or 7 hours. People who were on line waiting to take the literacy test found after waiting several hours and getting to the head of the line, that suddenly they were in the wrong line. They were advised that this was the line for registration only and that they had to get in another line to take the literacy test. In another case, prospective voters were given five literacy tests instead of one, having to take all of the tests to qualify for registration. We could document any number of such occurrences during every election period throughout the city and State of New York.

I submit, therefore, that the literacy test is wrong as a matter of principle and that it is wrong as a matter of practice. We ask that this Congress take action to do away with the literacy test. You may say, "Why doesn't the State of New York take action?" I want to remind you that the requirement of the literacy test is a provision in the New York State constitution and that when Mayor Wagner spoke out publicly against the literacy tests the mail coming into city hall was four to one against such a change. It is clear from this experience that an amendment to the State constitution which would require the vote of the people of the State of New York, would encounter great opposition in the State. So, therefore, it would be idle to suggest that we should be the ones to correct this wrong. In fact, those people whose very rights are in question, Puerto Ricans and Negroes, would not be participants in this election since they are unregistered. Our only recourse, gentlemen, is through action by this Congress. This action could be taken in one of two ways.

1. By amendment to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I would not, of course, presume to suggest the exact language of an amendment to this committee, but I would request that such an amendment provide that the benefits of this act apply to a political subdivision of a small enough size, such as the assembly district or preferably the election district, that would be of benefit to the Puerto Rican community in New York. I understand that the attorney general has been thinking in

terms of the county when he speaks of political subdivision. Certainly this kind of political subdivision is adequate for many of the rural areas of the South but I would call to your attention that the county of which the chairman of this committee is one of the Representatives, the County of Kings, which is only one of the counties of New York has over 3 million residents. The Puerto Rican community in this county, while considerable in number and larger than that of most counties of the South, forms less than 10 percent of the 3 million people involved. The only proper way in which the benefits of the legislation could be extended to insure the greatest protection of voting rights would be to provide that the 50-percent requirement of registration of eligible voters be applied to a small enough political subdivision, such as the election district. If there were sufficient time we would not hesitate to show that there are many election districts and some assembly districts in predominantly Puerto Rican areas where less than 50 percent of the eligible voters are registered.

By providing a small enough political subdivision you would not only be helping the Puerto Rican, you would be helping the purpose which President Johnson has been seeking. There are many urban areas of the South where the counties are so large that the Negro people who should be registered would constitute such a percentage of the total county as not to be beneficiaries of the provisions of this law.

2. Attorney General Katzenbach was reported in the New York Times, when he testified before this committee last Friday, to have stated that although he was sympathetic to and understood the difficulties of the Puerto Rican community, it was his judgment the present bill could not provide relief for the Puerto Rican. The news article continued as follows: "But Mr. Katzenbach told the Constitutional Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee that he felt deeply about this situation. It is his view, he said, that the English language test disenfranchises 'many intelligent citizens' of Puerto Rican birth.

"It would be preferable, he said, if New York State corrected this obvious discrimination. But if the New York State Legislature did not act, he said, he is confident that Congress could.

"He expressed some doubt that the problem could be met under the authority of the 15th amendment, which forbids the denial or abridgment of the right to vote because of race or color.

"Presumably his doubt rested, first, on the question of whether Puerto Ricans could be covered by the words 'race' and 'color.' Second, there is no evidence, as there is in several southern States, that New York's literacy test was adopted to permit racial discrimination in registration."

I have already pointed out the reasons why it is unlikely that the Puerto Rican community in New York can expect any relief from legislation in New York State since the abolition would require an amendment to the constitution of New York State where the Puerto Rican would not have a voice in the voting. Accordingly, it is perfectly clear that if the relief is going to be provided it will have to come from this Congress. If the Attorney General understands the problem, is in sympathy with it, and wants to prevent the disenfranchisement of Puerto Ricans of New York State, then why is no action being taken by him? I ask on behalf of the Puerto Ricans of New York for the introduction of a companion bill to the Voting Rights Act of 1965, under the 14th amendment of the Constitution, which would take the action that New York State cannot and will not do, and would unequivocally declare the literacy test provision of the State of New York totally invalid and without effect. I ask that this be done now.

OPPORTUNITY FOR OUR PEOPLE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 126)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The promise of America is opportunity for our people. It must therefore be a matter of concern to all Americans when any of our fellow citizens is denied the chance to build a full life for himself and his family.

Yet this is the condition of life for millions of our fellow citizens in areas of distress scattered across the continent.

At a time of instant communication and swift transport it is difficult to realize how varied are the regions of this country. Abundance and opportunity, progress and hope are, however, not evenly spread over the land. The same diversity of conditions which contributes to the richness of our society and culture, also bears with harsh inequality on those in stricken stretches of America.

A wide array of programs and weapons has been called into action to make sure no American is denied opportunity because of his race, or lack of education, or the poverty of his birth.

As our people more fully realize their human potential, we must be sure that the economic potential in all areas and regions is also realized. Indeed, in order to be fully effective, education programs, health programs, the programs of the war on poverty, and many other activities require complementary efforts to promote sound economic conditions and the proper physical environment.

Opportunity should not be closed to any person because of the circumstances of the area in which he lives.

Moreover the distress or underdevelopment of any part of the country holds back the progress of the entire Nation. This has been one of the great lessons of the last 30 years. Region after region from the Deep South to the Far West has been brought into the mainstream of our economic life. The consequence has been increased vitality and strength, not only in those areas whose resources had been previously underemployed, but for the Nation as a whole. Nonetheless, much remains to be done.

A growing nation cannot afford to waste those resources, human and natural, which are now too often neglected and unused in distressed areas. We cannot afford the loss of buying power and of national growth which flow from widespread poverty. Above all, we cannot afford to shut out large numbers of our fellow citizens from the fulfillment of hope which is shared by the rest. For that would be the denial of the promise of America itself.

The troubles and the potentials of depressed areas which contain approximately 27 million people vary widely. They are scattered across almost every section of the country. But they share certain common characteristics.

Nearly always their population growth is well below the national average, and often it is declining. Large areas in Illinois, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and elsewhere have lost more than twenty percent of their population in the last decade, while America as a whole was increasing its numbers by almost as much.

This pattern of decline is a symptom of economic distress. For in these areas employment and income are far below the national average. Unemployment rates of 10 to 15 percent are not uncommon. In dozens of counties more than 50 percent of all families have annual incomes of less than $2,000.

Worst of all, the distressed area is usually caught in a web of circumstances which block progress and lead to further decline.

Young people are forced to leave school earlier to help support their families, thus depriving themselves of needed skills and knowledge. Many young people must leave families and homes behind them in search of greater opportunity, stripping the area of badly needed skill and energy. Older men and women tend to stay on, clinging to the communities and friends which have been part of their lives and which enrich their existence.

As income goes down, these areas are less and less able to support schools, hospitals, and other public facilities needed to train their people and otherwise equip them to meet the demands of modern life. They are often too poor to provide the public structure—from roads to water—needed to attract new business and new jobs. The result is a steadily mounting toll in human poverty and retardation of the Nation's progress.

To break this downward spiral, to restore vitality and forward motion to America's distressed areas, I recommend a program of area and regional economic development—focused upon the economic needs of distressed areas and aimed at providing the conditions which can lead to growth. This program will be based primarily upon the experience of the accelerated public works program, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and the Appalachian Regional Development Commission.

The economic development of distressed areas, like that of a nation, is an enormously complex process. It requires work and cooperation from both public and private enterprise. It requires partnership between officials at every level of government—local, county, State, and Federal. It demands attention to a wide diversity of development needs—from improved transportation and water supply to industrial incentives and public facilities. It means that the varied resources and abilities of each region must be harnessed in a concerted effort to build a solid economic base for increasing industry, bringing with it more jobs and higher income.

In this effort we build upon the invaluable experience of the experimental area redevelopment program carried on for the last 4 years.

First, ARA has shown that helping businessmen to expand or to build new

plants, coupled with financial assistance to provide needed public facilities, can produce new jobs.

As of January 31, 1965, the Area Redevelopment Administration had approved 548 projects of which over 300 were in rural areas. These projects have and will assist in the creation of over 115,000 jobs. According to a recent study, more than three out of every four persons now working on ARA-assisted projects were not working full time prior to their present jobs. All of these jobs were in new, expanded or restored facilities.

Second, ARA has shown that the cost to the Government of creating these jobs is less than the cost of supporting these workers and their families through public assistance programs.

It has been estimated that, taking into account all outlays, the average nonreturnable one-time cost to the Federal Government for each job is about $800. More than this is saved in not having to pay unemployment compensation and welfare benefits to persons employed as a result of ARA activities. The cost is made once—the benefits continue as long as the jobs last.

Third, ARA has shown that people in our communities will work together in economic self-help programs.

Under the area redevelopment program, more than 1,000 local committees have been formed to work on overall economic development programs. Some of the programs are producing dividends without any other Federal aid whatsoever.

Fourth, ARA has shown that counties can be advantageously grouped together to promote cooperation on problems of mutual economic interest.

Under the area redevelopment program some 75 multicounty programs have been approved. The counties of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, for example, are tackling common problems with their own regional organization called UPCAP. The counties of southeastern Ohio are jointly organized through Ohio University to assist in the growth of local industries. Northeastern Pennsylvania is working under the leadership of Wilkes College to plan and carry out an areawide economic development program.

Drawing on this past experience we can now move ahead with a long-range program of area and regional economic development to assist in restoring economic health to distressed areas of America.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

Under the new program three basic principles will guide our action.

First, we will devote maximum effort to providing the conditions under which our private enterprise system can provide jobs and increased income. It is up to private business to take advantage of improved conditions for making profits by expanding present businesses or starting new ones, thereby increasing opportunity for the people of the region.

Second, no Federal plan or Federal project will be imposed on any regional, State or local body. No area will be declared distressed by Federal decree. No economic development district will be designated unless the State and local people want it to be designated. No plan will be approved unless it also has the approval of State and local authorities. No programs or projects will be originated at the Federal level. The initiative, the ideas, and the request for assistance must all come to Washington, not from Washington.

Third, the Federal Government will seek full value from every dollar spent or loaned under this program. Every proposal will be tested to see if it offers substantial promise of increasing economic development commensurate with the Federal funds involved. Only if a project meets this test will it be approved. Over the years the increased economic activity stimulated by this program will return its cost many times to the Federal Treasury.

ORGANIZATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

A key feature of this new program is the proposal to group together distressed counties and communities in economically viable development districts. Planning and assistance will concentrate on the needs of the area as a whole, as well as on individual counties and towns. Moreover, for planning many programs it makes sense to work in terms of larger regions encompassing in some cases parts of two or more States.

This is merely the recognition of a simple fact. Neither distress nor the potential for development respects State, county, or community boundaries. The economies of many areas are an organic whole. Just as many counties have declined together, they must advance together if they are to advance at all.

For individual counties and communities are often not capable of individual growth. Their industry must draw upon workers from other areas, and this means educated and trained workers must be available. Factories in communities in other counties can offer employment and rising income to their people. Large scale public facilities can be built most economically if they are designed to serve the needs of a large area. Many other Federal programs, such as assistance in the construction of hospitals, can be carried on more effectively if they are consistent with a genuine, regionwide program of development.

Often places which are not themselves in distress can with help and stimulation provide new jobs for the people of a surrounding distressed region.

Grouping counties together will permit assistance to be concentrated on those communities and industries whose rapid development offers the most hope for all the people of a region.

Thus, we hope to work with regions which contain all the components of economic advance, unhampered by rigid boundaries.

The new organization for development will have four main components:

First, redevelopment areas: The counties and labor commuting areas which are the basic units of the region, and where employment and income figures reveal conditions of distress and provide a measure of progress.

Second, economic development districts: Organizations of distressed areas—generally multicounty in nature—which will work together on common problems and can sustain economic growth once the development process is started.

Third, action planning commissions for regions: Multistate regions where comprehensive, long-range economic planning can be carried out by joint Federal-State commissions, to solve economic problems too large or difficult to be dealt with on a local basis.

Fourth, economic development centers: The places where resources can be most swiftly and effectively used to create more jobs and higher income for the people of the surrounding area. These centers may or may not themselves be distressed. Successful development is frequently easier to achieve when a number of activities are located in a single community large enougn to offer the advantages which flow from size itself. Clusters of industry tend to attract other industry. And such clusters offer the prospect of increased economic activity and improved economic health of the entire area.

To implement this design for development I recommend that the Secretary of Commerce be given authority to: (1) designate redevelopment areas on the basis of data relating to unemployment or income; (2) work with States to organize multicounty economic development districts; (3) include in such districts economic development centers not otherwise eligible for designation as redevelopment areas; and (4) invite and encourage States to establish multistate regional action planning commissions to prepare long-range action programs to improve the economic growth of the region.

This program, national in scope, is intended to aid those areas most in need of assistance throughout the country. Accordingly, it is necessary to provide objective criteria to determine those areas qualified for assistance under the program, and thus the bill contains measurable standards for eligibility based on either unemployment or median family income statistics. Qualifying unemployment data would be the same as in the Area Redevelopment Act. In addition, counties could qualify if the median family income is less than 40 percent of the national median.

Indian areas would be designated after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior.

When there has been a sudden plant shutdown or closing of a military installation, the Secretary would be authorized to designate areas for assistance if he determines that the area can be expected to become eligible within 3 years unless assistance is provided.

The program will contain standards which insure that aid is concentrated on areas of real need, and that it is being distributed on an objective basis.

INSTRUMENTS OF DEVELOPMENT

Our experience with various forms of assistance under ARA and the accelerated public works program has shown

us ways to improve our techniques and our tools for providing economic growth.

DIRECT GRANT PROGRAM

I recommend a direct grant program for development facilities related to economic development and matched at 50 percent of the cost of the project. In addition, because of the long-term economic depression in many of the depressed areas, I am recommending authorization of supplementary grants to help the most needy communities to meet their matching share of Federal grant-in-aid programs. Additional Federal assistance up to 80 percent of the net project cost would be made available to communities unable to take advantage of regular Federal programs because of their inability to raise the required local share. These supplemental payments to needy communities would be limited to programs assisting in the construction or equipment of development facility projects, including those eligible for 50 percent grants under this proposed legislation.

An annual authorization of $250 million for grants for development facilities and supplemental payments is being requested.

LOAN PROGRAMS

The existing ARA program of loans for land, building, machinery, and equipment has provided loans at 4 percent interest, of up to 65 percent of the cost of the project for industrial or commercial facilities. As of January 31, 1965, 396 projects have been approved under this program amounting to an investment of $173 million in ARA funds.

Private capital has participated with the Federal Government to a great extent in these projects. All told, approximately $127 million has been invested in these projects from all non-Federal sources, of which some 300 private banking institutions have invested more than $40 million.

Nevertheless, we need to do more to encourage greater utilization of private capital in redevelopment projects. To this end, I propose that the Secretary of Commerce be authorized to reimburse approved borrowers 2 percentage points of the cost of interest to them for up to 10 years on money borrowed from private institutions for expansion or establishment of plants in redevelopment areas in accordance with the development programs.

This proposal will stimulate greater use of private capital in recovery and development. Moreover, it avoids tying up large blocks of Federal funds over long periods of time. The Federal Government's share of these new contracts during any one year would be limited to $5 million. This would facilitate and encourage $250 million of private investment annually in depressed areas.

I am also recommending that authority be granted to guarantee working capital loans up to 90 percent. These guarantees would be available to supplement other financial assistance under this program.

The present Area Redevelopment Act program of low-cost 40-year loans for development facilities would be continued largely unchanged under the new program.

These direct loans and loan guarantees would be available to firms where their activities promise to create increased long-term employment.

An annual authorization of $170 million is recommended for a revolving fund, which would include direct loans for commercial and industrial facilities, loans for development facilities, and reserve for working capital guarantees.

The present requirement in the Area Redevelopment Act that State or local public agencies provide 10 percent of the cost of industrial projects, and that local investors must wait until the Federal loan has been entirely repaid before receiving repayment of principal, has worked a hardship on many needy communities. Accordingly, I am recommending that this requirement be reduced to 5 percent of the project cost and that repayment be concurrent with repayment of the Federal loan. In exceptionally needy cases, the Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to waive the 5-percent requirement. However, in no case will there be a waiver of the requirement that at least 15 percent of the total project cost be invested as equity or on a lien subordinate to that of the Federal investment.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

It is not enough to simply help finance projects. These projects must be part of a comprehensive plan to build a viable economy. To do this we must provide technical assistance and encourage the formation of development organizations large enough to hire trained people to prepare comprehensive plans and carry them out. For these purposes, I am recommending the following new types of assistance:

Grants and technical assistance to Regional Action Planning Commissions to enable them to prepare long-range regional economic development programs within the context of overall industrial, transportation, recreation, and other natural resource planning. An annual authorization of $15 million is proposed for this purpose.

Grants and technical assistance to multicounty economic development districts for formulating overall economic development plans.

Additional Federal grants of 10 percent for development facility projects which are part of an approved district development plan, as a special incentive to encourage communities to work together.

Federal grants and loans for designated economic development centers in order that economic development districts will have resources sufficient to sustain their growth.

For the last two purposes I am recommending an authorization of $50 million. To allow ample time for the States to prepare well-thought-out action programs, no projects would be approved under this authorization until 1 year after enactment of the legislation.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

This enlarged and redirected program of economic development will be administered by the Department of Commerce, which has also been responsible for the existing experimental program. The legislation I am proposing would create the position of Economic Development Administrator in that Department. The functions and powers of the existing Area Redevelopment Administration would be transferred to a successor organization to be created by the Secretary of Commerce to administer the new act.

Many other Federal programs also can contribute to the economic development of distressed areas. It is essential that these programs be closely coordinated to make sure resources are used with maximum effectiveness in reaching the common goal of a higher standard of living for the people of these regions. Therefore, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to work closely with interested departments and agencies in achieving a coordinated Federal effort. It is especially important that this effort be carried forward in close cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The antipoverty program will help people improve their ability to obtain and hold a job. This program is designed to increase the number of jobs available to those who want to work. Obviously both efforts are essential to the future growth of distressed areas. I intend to see that they work closely together toward the common objective.

CONCLUSION

There are three important things to remember about this program. First, it is designed to extend opportunity to those now deprived of a full chance to share in the blessings of American life. As such it has a call upon the moral conscience of every citizen.

Second, it will benefit all Americans. The experience of the last 30 years has shown conclusively that the increasing prosperity of any region of this country increases the prosperity of the Nation. We have truly become a national economy. Higher incomes for the people of Illinois or Arkansas mean increased markets for automobiles from Detroit and steel from Pittsburgh. Poverty in one area slows progress in other areas.

Third, the job can be done. We have the resources and the skill to extend American abundance to every citizen and every region of this land. This program will help give us the instruments to match our determination to eliminate poverty in America.

The conditions of our distressed areas today are among our most important economic problems. They hold back the progress of the Nation, and breed a despair and poverty which is inexcusable in the richest land on earth. We will not permit any part of this country to be a prison where hopes are crushed, human beings chained to misery, and the promise of America denied.

The conditions of our depressed areas can and must be righted. In this generation they will be righted.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1965.*

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE WYDLER AT FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR QUALITY CONTROL

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently the Long Island section of the American Society for Quality Control presented their fourth annual conference at Hofstra University in Hempstead, N.Y. The principal speaker was my colleague, JOHN W. WYDLER, who represents the Fourth Congressional District of New York, where the conference was held.

Representatives from all over the United States attended this conference, designed to cover a broad spectrum of interest involving management, engineering, and reliability. The conference was a great success and the speech given by my colleague, Congressman WYDLER, was praised both for its content and timeliness as to the future of American industrial precision and the Long Island area which it represents. I wish to enter it in the RECORD.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE WYDLER

The American Society for Quality Control has been an increasingly important influence in the development of American technology. This is attested to by the rapid growth of your society, particularly the Long Island section, in numbers of members; and, more importantly, by the acknowledgment of your influence in the reliability of our military and space hardware, and the improved image of American goods and services throughout the world. I congratulate you on your efforts. They are in the finest American tradition—being voluntary, stressing individual initative and dedicated to making things better.

In the 89th Congress, which is now well underway, I have once again been elected to serve on the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House of Representatives. My committee has just completed several weeks of intensive briefings by officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Council in connection with the authorization of the NASA budget for fiscal year 1966. My remarks today will attempt to point up some directions which I see the space program taking and some possible new courses of action in which you in industry can be of assistance.

It seems to me that quality control and reliability have been shown to be a basic factor in the competition between the United States and Russia for space supremacy. Our program is designed to accomplish the three goals of contributing to national security, exploring space for scientific purposes, and achieving preeminence in space technology for international prestige. Since 1957 when the Russian sputnik thrust us abruptly into this competition, up to the present time and possibly well into the future, we have been working under a basic handicap of insufficient booster capability. In comparison with the Russian program, every experiment which we have devised has had to be accomplished with a limited payload weight. As a result, our equipments have had to reach a high state of reliability without the "luxury of redundancy" which greater booster power might afford.

It is not possible to make a detailed point-by-point comparison of the United States and Russian programs and arrive at any overall answer to the question as to who is ahead. Each country has areas of superiority. Certainly, the Russians have produced no program of applications satellites which would match our proven capability in communications, meterology, geodetics, and navigation. On the other hand, last year's three-man Russian space vehicle again demonstrated the substantial lead which they have in manned space flight. According to Dr. Charles Sheldon of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, the Russian backlog of experience in manned space flight is "still substantially greater than our own, possibly as great as 37 Mercury orbits versus about 280 sputnik cosmic ship orbits." The launching of our two-man Gemini next Tuesday heralds the beginning of a second accelerated phase of American manned flight. And the speed of development is shown by the fact that in the last few days the Russians have added 17 new orbits and walked in space. These developments add a new urgency to your mission.

The Russian capability to include redundancy is nowhere better illustrated than in the Voskhod vehicle and its "shirt sleeve" environment. Our concept of life-support system for astronauts has evolved from the military practice of high-altitude pressure suits. Although most of our pilots complain of the restrictions on movement inherent in these cumbersome garments, we have felt that the protection of the individual against leakage from the space capsule was so important that the personally fitted space suit was necessary. The Russians, having the booster power to launch a large roomy vehicle, are able to allow their cosmonauts the increased freedom of action of a shirt sleeve environment and in addition carry pressure suits onboard which could be donned in an emergency. Our Gemini and Apollo launch vehicles simply do not afford the weight-carrying ability for a backup system even if our astronauts had room within the capsule to struggle into the suits. Size is a factor in reliability—and the Russians are ahead.

Another aspect of quality control in the Russian and American programs may be gained from examination of the relative civilian technologies of the two countries. Frequent references appear in the Communist press as to the shoddiness of Russian goods such as telephones, washing machines, tractors, and TV sets. In 1950, according to a report by the Library of Congress, the Soviet Union began an intensive program to improve quality control but continuing complaints of disrupted factory schedules and high maintenance of consumer appliances indicate that progress has been very slow and disappointing. Of course, this deficiency in quality control in consumer goods may not carry over into the Russian space program for it is obvious that such a totalitarian regime can divert the best talents into high priority work for the Government. Soviet propaganda has given us a picture of virtual infallibility as far as their space program is concerned. Nevertheless, responsible U.S. officials have stated that the Soviet failure rate overall is somewhat like our own. No details are made available because of the classified nature of U.S. information. We do have public knowledge of 10 Soviet failures in escape missions contrasted with their 8 successful launches to lunar and planetary flight.

In comparison with Russia's poor reputation for reliability in commercial technical products, the United States entered the space age with a historical attitude which included mass production standards and planned obsolescence. These hallmarks of Western technology have proved, perhaps, to be as much of a drawback to success in space as the Russian shoddiness. However, it is testimony to the diligence with which your profession has pursued its business that the United States has achieved at least as good a record of success-to-failure ratio as has Russia—and without the aforementioned booster power.

An impressive American achievement seems to be in the making in the so-called guaranteed reliability concept. The appearance of quality control and reliability specifications concurrent with the increased usage of incentive contracting may be the most significant development in industry-Government relations in some time. I am aware of the conclusion of the Aerospace Industry Association Committee on Electric Systems reliability which was published recently. It states that "Once the problems of describing and measuring reliability have been solved, the use of incentive contracts for reliability may increase rapidly." I believe this will mean a marked improvement in the management of federally funded research as well as increased profits for industry.

Another excellent result of recent efforts in American quality control is the renaissance of craftsmanship and pride of workmanship which seemed to have been lost in our industry with the advent of automation and production-line methods. I am referring here to the basic concept, sometimes called the "zero defects" program. The goal of this program, to prevent all defects, will have benefits not only for the Government and industry but for the individual worker.

The zero-defects program is a good example of how concepts, devices, and processes developed in our space program can have a salutary effect on the entire American economy. These fallout or spinoff applications are a valuable by-product of Government research and are used, to some extent, to justify large-scale Federal technology programs. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that the fallout benefits cannot be

obtained merely by Government efforts to disseminate information. The successful spinoff is more often characterized by a degree of cleverness and innovation in the user industry which is quite comparable to the ingenuity which went into the original discovery.

An example of Federal information dissemination efforts are the Technical Information Centers set up by the NASA. We need one of these on Long Island. I will continue my best efforts to secure one for our area.

More specific examples of the adaptation of defense-space quality-control techniques to commercial products are being brought to light every day. Household applicances manufacturers have often incurred the wrath of customers over products which failed after a short time or required substantial maintenance. Computer companies which leased their equipment and were responsible for the maintenance themselves also began to examine their reliability policies. With the orientation of business becoming increasingly sympathetic to the customer, companies such as Raytheon, Westinghouse, Bell [redacted], and IBM have paid considerably more attention to the time element in reliability and have increased their product life. The result of this is already shown in increased profits. Management has informed its engineers that it is just as important to make reliable products as it is to invent new ones. And the technical skills required are comparable. The profit motive is having its effect on reliability control.

I would now like to turn to the future direction of the space program and indicate at least one area where the prediction of reliability has a substantial bearing on our policies. The applications satellite program is one of our proudest achievements. It has made possible a unique combination of Government and free enterprise in the Communications Satellite Corp. Other future applications may also be developed and operated by private industry. One such device which may prove feasible in the next year is the navigation satellite. A report of the Joint Navigation Satellite Committee will be made this summer and may recommend further development of an operational system. Congress would then be asked to establish a policy for the commercial use of the satellite.

These commercial application satellites must be shown to have a reasonable chance of profit before they will be accepted over ground-based alternatives. The possibility of profit is also a turning point in the decisions of the Government to subsidize the project and in industrial participation in it. Since the launch costs of these satellites make up a large share of the total funding, the profit becomes extremely dependent upon useful life in orbit. For example, a navigation satellite would compete with various ground-based systems. If chosen for eventual development, the costs would have to be recovered by a charge to the user, the individual ship or aircraft owner who would install receiving equipment. The profits from this charge would depend greatly on the lifetime of each satellite. Once the system was placed in orbit, most of the costs to the operator would be over until a replacement system had to be launched. If it seemed unlikely that sufficient reliability could be attained to insure profit, then the decision to go ahead with the development on a commercial basis might have to be deferred. One suggested design for a navigational satellite set a goal of at least 3 years' life in orbit for economic feasibility. Certain currently available components showed a mean time to failure of only 12,000 hours or about 1½ years so that these components would have to be duplicated in the satellite. This is feasible but adds a weight penalty to the proposed system.

Another instance of reliability in the space program is provided by the recent successful launching of the Pegasus, a meteroid detection satellite. The hearings before my committee brought out the fact that this experiment is really a "hitchhiker" on the Saturn I booster while the latter is in development. However, the confidence in our knowledge of the meteroid hazard which will be developed by the statistically large body of data from the three planned Pegasus launchings could pay off many times if it leads to more reliable design of our future space vehicles with minimum weight meteroid shielding. However, the need for three such shots has yet to be proven to my satisfaction.

Thus, quality control, reliability engineering, and careful design can combine to give our space program the maximum potential for the dollars which we invest.

The success of NASA's recent space accomplishments attest to the benefits to be derived from a vigorous and stringent quality assurance program. With respect to NASA launch vehicles, the success records of several workhorses deserve particular mention: 8 Saturn launches without a failure, 11 solid-fueled Scout successes in the last 12 flights, 28 successful Atlas flights in the last 29 attempts, and Thor-Delta has placed 8 of 9 Tiros weather satellites into successful orbit. Spacecraft quality and reliability has shown substantial improvement. NASA has a current record of approximately 90 percent successful spacecraft in spite of the fact that second and third generation spacecraft are far more complex and contain many more parts than the first primitive models of a few years back. Also, the useful life of unmanned satellites has been increased to the point that operation for periods of a year or more is now the rule rather than the exception.

The direction of our space program is easy for me to tell you about—up until 1970, at least. That is because we are committed to the Apollo program. The attempt at a manned lunar landing is the only approved space program which NASA has. This is a peculiarity of our national policy which needs substantial thought in the immediate future. Many of our research and development programs such as the nuclear-electric power source SNAP–8, the liquid hydrogen fuel M–1 engine and the 260-inch solid-propellent motor, are caught in a "requirements merry-go-round." This reasoning prevents their full development until a specific mission requirement is pinned down.

On the other hand, our space planners have not come forward to Congress with any requests for post-Apollo missions. It is time such plans were formulated and accepted. The long-range leadtime of many advanced research and technology programs makes it obvious that such plans should be forthcoming soon. To a great extent, these plans depend upon an extension of what is possible with present and predictable future equipments. Since over 70 percent of NASA's research is done in extramural laboratories, it is up to industry to continually generate ideas for space planning and I know that many of the companies represented here today spend substantial amounts of their own money on such original proposals. But the synthesis of a national program consistent with our goals and the wise allocation of resources can only be finalized by the Federal agencies involved.

The interim report of the Federal Council for Science and Technology for the year 1963—which was just recently issued—states the need for long-range planning because of "a foreseeable reduction in the rate of growth of Federal expenditures for development, primarily as a result of the evolution of the programs of NASA and the Department of Defense." The significant phrase is "reduction in the rate of growth." No one believes that the space program is going to come to a halt with the accomplishment of the Apollo lunar landing. However, we must proceed immediately to formulate our plans for post-Apollo programs in terms of major NASA goals in order to avoid serious lag in long leadtime technology. In addition, such planning can prevent manpower and resource dislocations and establish guidelines for industry in seeking markets and demands outside the Federal Government for its products. There will be increasing Federal funding of research and development programs in other areas such as environmental pollution, desalination processes, transportation, and oceanography. We must get Long Island into this field and do it in a major way. Projections for the entire Federal Government are extremely complex and it will take a new alertness on the part of industry to keep up to date with rapidly shifting trends in science.

The future of Long Island industry in the continuing space program will depend on how well its leaders participate in the formulation of new NASA plans and other national technology programs and most importantly—how we work together. Increased effort will be required to equip your companies and focus your talents for successful competition bidding. We hear a great deal today about regional differences in distribution of Federal contracts. These inequities are real and we have felt some of them here in Long Island. Nevertheless, the status of your industries is much better than those in some of the other areas of the country which have yet to make a significant contribution to space technology. The chairman of my House Committee on Science and Astronautics, Mr. MILLER, of California, recently reiterated

the firm position that the NASA program cannot become a "WPA." This means that the only criterion for placing Federal contracts should be the competence of the bidder. Long Island need have no fears of losing contracts to California or Florida if we remain alert and well informed as to Federal plans and continue to strive for the goals of quality and reliability which are constantly promulgated by the American Society for Quality Control—and if we work together. The excellence of our products and services will continue to secure a leading role in the U.S. space program.

Finally, I wish to stress quality control of man himself—for man is a part of the system.

This is so whether he is the man in the capsule or the man on the ground building the capsule.

The man must be strong not only in mind and body—but most importantly in spirit as well.

That is America's ace-in-the-hole.

The recent Russian feats have to me primarily a military significance. They constitute a continuing threat to our national security.

In a broad sense then, our survival depends on quality control.

This is the challenge that faces you. I am confident you will be equal to the task.

THE REPUBLICAN HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL BILL

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, for the second year in a row the Republican members of the House Special Housing Subcommittee have developed and presented a major housing and urban renewal bill. The original announcement of this step this year was made on February 19, 1965.

The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] introduced H.R. 6623 on March 23, and my own bill, H.R. 6501, was introduced on March 18, 1965.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] have advised me that they will shortly introduce companion measures to these bills.

I am pleased to present a section-by-section analysis of the Republican housing and urban renewal bill for the information of my colleagues, who may wish to cosponsor it, and others.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT ACT XXXXXXX

Section 1, Short title: The bill would be cited as the "Housing and Redevelopment Act of 1965."

TITLE I—LOW-RENT HOUSING IN PRIVATE ACCOMMODATIONS

Section 101, housing requirements and rental payments:

This section provides a supplementary form of low-rent housing, utilizing existing privately owned housing. It identifies and defines such housing as that which is decent, safe, and sanitary, so certified by the local housing authority from quarters made available voluntarily by private owners. No more than 10 percent of the available units in a building could be used, except in the case of buildings with small numbers of units.

This section provides that the selection of tenants would be a joint function of the local housing agency and the property owner. Rents are to be negotiated between the local housing agency and the property owner, and payments of rent by tenants would go to the local housing agency who would pay that amount plus the local subsidy to the landlord.

Section 102, contract authority and number of units: This section would provide for a 2-year program of 30,000 units per year, 60,000 total, and for the payment of the subsidy under such contracts as are written in keeping with that of other public housing.

Section 103, income limits for occupancy and rents:

This section would provide the necessary language to allow the new program to conform to the present program in terms of the above.

The idea for a rent certificate or rent supplement approach to low-income housing was first suggested by Republicans in their housing bill of last year. A specific reference to the Republican bill is contained in the House Banking and Currency Committee report on the Housing Act of 1964, with a notation that this deserves further consideration. Since then the idea has gained widespread bipartisan support, and the administration has also given consideration to this approach.

The program, successfully carried out in Toronto, Canada, and on an experimental basis in other areas, has the advantage of providing immediate housing for those low-income citizens now faced with long waiting lists for conventional public housing. It is estimated that there are now sufficient conventional public housing units already authorized by Congress, and as yet not under construction, to occupy the Public Housing Administration's efforts in this field for the next 5 years. The rent supplement approach would allow PHA to correct this fault in its operations at the same time supplying as much or more needed housing than it has supplied on a yearly basis during the past decade or more.

At the same time, cost of the rent certificate operations would be far less than for conventional public housing, and the property used would remain on the local tax rolls, paying full property taxes. This approach to housing low-income families would stimulate rehabilitation, which in turn would enable property owners to meet housing and building code requirements. Together, these two operations would perform the joint function of eliminating slums while preserving neighborhoods.

TITLE II—URBAN RENEWAL AND REDEVELOPMENT

Section 201, study of housing and building codes, zoning, and tax policies:

The Congress finds that in order to determine how (1) property owners and private enterprise can be encouraged to serve as large a part of the housing need of the Nation as they can, and (2) Federal, State, and local governmental assistance can be directed to place greater reliance than in the past on local property owners and private enterprise for such purposes there is a need to study housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and development standards. The Federal Housing Administrator is directed to make such a study and submit a report on it to the Congress within 1 year of the enactment of this section. Such additional funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section are authorized.

This section builds on the Republican suggestion of last year for a study of tax policy, as well as the recommendation of the Joint Economic Committee's report of 1964 (p. 13), and is broadened to include areas mentioned by the President in his message on the cities. Unlike the President's study proposal, this report would be made directly to Congress, and its findings would thus be assured of publication. Only last year a Presidential Task Force on Housing and Urban problems was widely mentioned in the press as being in operation, yet no report regarding its study and findings has been released to the public or to Congress.

Section 202, conformity with minimum housing standards for welfare recipients: Section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended to provide that the use of Federal funds under title I, IV, VII, X, XI, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for payment, including rents, for housing accommodations be conditioned upon the establishment or designation of a State or local authority or authorities which shall be responsible for developing and maintaining standards of health and safety for such housing accommodations and upon such accommodations conforming to the minimum standards housing code, laws, and regulations relating to health, sanitation, and safety of buildings required by section 101(a) of the Housing Act of 1949.

The problem of social security recipients living in substandard housing has long concerned Congress, as well as leaders at the State, county, and municipal government level, as well as civic and religious leaders. The sudsidy of slum housing through Federal public welfare payments amounts, it has been estimated, to nearly $750 million a year.

The sad and terrible story of the slums occupied by our public welfare recipients was told by Edgar May, Pulitzer Prize winner, in his book, "The Wasted Americans," published by Harper & Row, who wrote that: "Probably more than 1 billion welfare dollars were paid to the order of landlords in the United States in 1962." This includes the largest unpublicized Government subsidy in the Nation. For, in too many instances, it quietly subsidizes slums. In part, it constitutes the premium payments of a national housing shortage that is most acute among the poor.

Section 202 is similar to section 4 of H.R. 5839 introduced by our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS] in the 88th Congress in response to the President's message on the problems of the elderly.

Section 203, establishment of priority for residential projects, and a loan program for profitable commercial redevelopment:

This section would amend section 102 of the Housing Act of 1949 by adding at the end a new subsection which would provide that in connection with any project on land which is to be redeveloped for nonresidential and nonpublic use, the Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner would be authorized to make loans instead of grants to municipalities or local public agencies. Such loans would be in such amounts not exceeding two-thirds of the aggregate net project cost, and would bear interest at a rate of not less than the going Federal rate plus one-half of 1 percent; except that such a loan would bear no interest for any period prior to the date on which the land involved is sold or otherwise disposed of by the municipality or local public agency. No part of any such loan would be required to be repaid during any year unless the real property tax revenues derived during such year from the redeveloped property are in excess of the average annual real property tax revenues which are derived from the same property during the 5 years immediately preceding condemnation of such property. The Commissioner would require repayment of no less than 20 percent of the increase in tax revenues for any particular area.

Financial assistance would not be extended with respect to any urban renewal area which is not predominantly residential in character and which, under the urban renewal plan therefor, is not to be redeveloped for predominantly residential or public uses unless the governing body of the local public agency certifies to the URA Commissioner and he finds that all residential redevelopment necessary or appropriate in the community is completed, under construction, or planned for.

The pressure for commercial redevelopment funds has often resulted in the neglect of true housing needs. As of March 1964, Prof. William G. Grigsby, of the University of Pennsylvania, found that 25 percent of the communities receiving Federal aid had no residential reuse projects, and another 25 percent had less than 50 percent in residential reuse. As of April 1964, statistics show that a city as large as Cleveland, Ohio, had 56 percent of its funds in nonresidential use projects, despite rent strikes, a 221(d)(3) failure, and other evidences of housing neglects. The priority for residential housing is clearly needed in the law.

At the same time, private enterprise has demonstrated that even without urban renewal assistance, profitable commercial redevelopment is possible. The loan program envisioned by the bill would require no repayment without an increase in real property tax revenue from the project, the justification for most such projects, and thus would continue to subsidize those projects needing such assistance. Although the URA Commissioner could set a repayment schedule above the minimum of 20 percent of the tax revenue increase, we expect that the city under all circumstances would reap the great majority of the benefits of the increased tax revenues. To ask the cities to make a minimum effort to repay where they can afford to do so, however, seems appropriate in light of the fact that the homeowner, tenant, and small businessman is required to repay his loan in full under the rehabilitation loan sections of the Housing Act of 1964, and the home improvement loan sections of the Housing Act of 1961.

Section 204, priority for low- and middle-income housing in urban renewal areas: Section 105(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 would be amended by this section to provide that at least 50 percent of any housing which may be constructed in any urban renewal project would be designed for occupancy by persons from the lower middle-income, and low-income segments of the population as determined by the local public agency in accordance with regulations prescribed by the URA Commissioner, and that the rentals, sales, or other charges to be established for living accommodations in the housing so designed and made available will not exceed the level which such persons can reasonably be expected to pay.

Concern for the present overemphasis on luxury housing and commercial redevelopment was expressed from both sides of the aisle in the debate on the Housing Act of 1964 in the House. A study by Professor Grigsby, of the University of Pennsylvania, concluded that only 20 percent of the $3 billion allocated for urban renewal so far has been used to provide lower income family shelter. This section would allow for an economic mixture of rental and sales housing with sufficient opportunity for profit to attract redevelopers, yet would place the priority where it belongs.

Section 205, relocation of displacees from urban renewal areas: This section would require a feasible method for the temporary relocation of individuals, families, and business concerns displaced from urban renewal project areas, and the provision in other areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities at rents or prices within the financial means of the displacees. A further provision requires that the project shall be carefully staged to insure that persons are not displaced any more rapidly than they can be relocated, that the relocation will be carried out with a minimum of hardship to those displaced, with particular emphasis on devices designed to facilitate continued operation of the business concerns to be displaced, such as staggered displacement of such concerns, reduced rents, and so on.

The Commissioner shall require, within a reasonable time prior to the actual relocation of any displacee, a certification from the local public agency that the requirements of this section have been complied with, and a certification that each dwelling unit used for the relocation of any displacee has been inspected and is in full compliance with the applicable housing and building codes. If the URA Commission finds that the local public agency is not complying with any such requirement, or that any part of the housing and building accommodations so required are not actually available no further assistance shall be made available by the URA with respect to such urban renewal project until such noncompliance ends. Business concerns displaced would be accorded a priority of opportunity to return to and relocate in such urban renewal area.

One of the major areas of failure and hardship in urban renewal has been relocation. Studies by the General Accounting Office, the Connecticut Advisory Committee on Civil Rights, academic and private sources have disclosed relocation into other slum areas. There is evidence that relocation officials do not have sufficient information on those displaced from an urban renewal area, with relocation assistance often starting too late to aid those already moved away. In some cases, a lower standard has been used to judge the fitness of relocation housing than the standard used to justify the urban renewal project in the first place. Small business failures have averaged 35 percent from urban renewal displacement, according to the staff study of the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Public Works Committee. In another study prepared for the Small Business Administration by Brown University, many businesses were found relocating in areas as bad or worse than those they were displaced from. The Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives showed that virtually all of the 45,000 Negro enterprises are located in depressed urban residential neighborhoods, and an unusually large number of these are displaced by urban renewal.

Republican proposals adopted into the Housing Act of 1964, which recognized for the first time in either law or regulation the responsibility for business relocation assistance, are a start. But much more remains to be done. Recently new statistics have been published by the Housing and Home Finance Agency claiming improvements in relocation procedures, but 20 families out of every 100 relocated ending in slums, and 35 business failures out of every 100 businesses displaced, are still too high to be tolerated, given the original purpose of urban renewal, as well as its glowing promises. Of particular importance is a provision for more thorough verification of decent, safe, and sanitary relocation housing at the time of relocation, as recommended by the Connecticut Advisory Committee on Civil Rights. A simple process of certification that relocation housing was not in violation of any housing, building, health, or safety codes would provide additional protection, and promote code enforcement and compliance. Since the bulk of those being displaced are small businesses and low- and moderate-income families, a priority for low- and moderate-income housing in urban renewal projects, and a small business lease guarantee program, as suggested in other sections of this bill, would be particularly appropriate.

Section 206, prohibition against writedown on land to be used for profitable commercial redevelopment, except in case of displacees: This would amend section 105 of the Housing Act of 1949 by adding at the end thereof a new subsection providing that no real property acquired or held by the local public agency in connection with the project shall be sold for commercial redevelopment at a price less than the fair market value of the same quantity of land used for purposes for which such land is to be used in parts of the community other than an urban renewal area, unless the sale is to a person who owned, rented, or leased commercial property within that community, and who was forced to relocate from such property as a result of Government acquisition.

Section 207, rehabilitation of structures in urban renewal areas:

Rising national criticism has concentrated on the penchant of local planning and urban renewal officials for the acquisition and razing, with the aid of URA funds, of perfectly sound buildings. Under this section no structure shall be acquired, demolished, removed, or otherwise disposed of under an urban renewal plan if (a) such structure can be economically improved or modified to meet the requirements reasonably established by the local public agency for integration into the plan for the redevolpment or rehabilitation of the project area, and (b) the owner or lessee of such structure promptly agrees, and presents satisfactory evidence that he is able, to make such improvements or modifications (including the modifications necessary to develop the property in accordance with any design criteria and objectives which may have been established for the project area) within such period of time as the local public agency determines to be reasonable. For the purposes of clause (b) above, the owner of record of any property shall be given first priority to improve, modify, or develop such property and the lessee (if any) shall have second priority.

This section would underscore the intent of the Congress expressed last year in the Housing Act of 1964 when it adopted the Republican proposals for priority for rehabilitation over clearance, and a new low interest rehabilitation loan plan. It would also be entirely in line with the comments by President Johnson in this year's message for "intensive rehabilitation" on a neighborhood scale.

A further provision of this section requires that the Housing Administrator must be furnished evidence that the applicable standards used for finding and declaring an area suitable for urban renewal shall, in the case of housing, building, health, and public safety codes and regulations, be in accordance with the housing, building, health, and public safety codes and regulations of the locality. The need for such a provision is shown by the GAO reports to Congress that localities use one standard for declaring an area suitable for urban renewal, and a lower one for relocating displacees into other areas.

Section 208, requirements of redevelopment in accordance with the urban renewal plan:

In many cities, after an urban renewal plan is launched, real property acquired, and residential and business buildings razed, the area lies vacant, sometimes for years, at a great loss to property tax revenues.

This is true in Washington's southwest urban renewal project, where a great deal of land has lain idle and vacant for 10 years. Twenty-three thousand persons lived in this area before urban renewal, 76 percent of whom were Negro, according to published reports, and most of these residents of the area were in the low and lower middle-income categories. The area now is more than 90

percent white under the city's highly publicized urban renewal program. Land in this area has lain idle for 10 years.

Once cleared, land in urban renewal projects in a number of cities has been used for parking lots while private developers have been sought. In other cases the plan for which the land was acquired has had to be scuttled, because a private developer could not be found willing and able to develop the property in line with the original plan. Washington's southwest urban renewal project is typical of this situation also, because the 530-acre project was acquired and promises given to provide that 40 percent of the housing units in the area would rent for $17 a room or less. After acquisition, displacement, and bulldozing, a new plan was substituted which provides rental apartments up to $500 a month, prime office space, and sales type housing up to $75,000 and more. Few of the former residents and property owners and businessmen of the area have been able to return to it, because of financial reasons.

This section attempts to forestall such problems by providing that no new contract for loan or capital grant under this title shall be entered into with any local public agency unless the LPA shall have furnished satisfactory evidence that the redevelopment of project areas previously approved have been undertaken and carried out in accordance with the urban renewal plans and with the terms of such contracts. In any case where contracts for more than 50 percent of the land required under the plan have not been entered into within 3 years after the date of final approval of the project no new contract for loan or capital grant under this title shall be entered into with any local public agency until contracts for more than 50 percent of the land acquired for redevelopment have been negotiated by the LPA.

Section 209, requirement that at least 30 percent of funds be used for code enforcement and rehabilitation projects: This section would provide a floor under the rehabilitation and code enforcement provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 by requiring that at least 30 percent of the aggregate amount of grants and loans contracted for under this title and under section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964 shall be for projects which involve primarily code enforcement and rehabilitation.

Last year, Congress enacted several provisions of the Housing Act of 1964 which dealt with rehabilitation and code enforcement, based on provisions in the Republican housing bill. The President cited these sections particularly in signing the Housing Act of 1964, and this year he has called for increased effort in the area of code enforcement and rehabilitation. Unfortunately, the administrators of the program have failed to respond adequately to the challenge. No funding of last year's $50 million authorization for the rehabilitation loan program was requested in the final supplemental appropriations bill last year. Regulations regarding either the loan program or code enforcement urban renewal projects have been unnecessarily slow in developing. Since commercial renewal has been allocated, by law, 30 percent of the available funds, it seems only logical to allocate, by law, at least that amount of available funds for the much more productive and rewarding code enforcement and rehabilitation-oriented projects. Prevention of blight, the preservation of neighborhoods, and the more economical and widespread use of the tools for code enforcement and rehabilitation are steps to which we must adhere with action as well as words.

Section 210, facilities whose cost will be recovered out of revenues: This section deals with a problem which was revealed in a June 1962 GAO review of noncash grant-in-aid credits allowed for publicly owned parking facilities and the position of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the matter.

The GAO suggested to Congress that it "may wish to consider enacting legislation which would amend the Housing Act of 1949 to exclude from noncash grants-in-aid all publicly owned facilities to the extent that the capital costs of such facilities are contemplated to be recovered out of revenues derived from their operations." An amendment to this effect has not been adopted thus far.

In its 1962 report to Congress the GAO disclosed that "In connection with certain slum clearance and urban renewal projects, URA has tentatively allowed noncash grant-in-aid credits amounting to $9.3 million for certain land and construction costs applicable to six publicly owned parking facilities. The cities where the facilities are located plan to recover, out of revenues derived from the operations, the entire costs of the parking facilities. The effect of allowing these noncash grants-in-aid will be that the cities will be reimbursed in amounts in excess of the actual costs of the facilities. The entire costs, totaling about $12 million, will be recovered through user charges, and, in addition, about $6 million will be contributed by the Federal Government as a result of the grants-in-aid being included in the project."

Dr. Robert C. Weaver, the HHFA Administrator, advised the Congress at the time that: "Special problems have arisen with respect to parking facilities because of the extent to which they are frequently revenue producing and because they provide a service which is often similar to that provided by private enterprise. We believe that these problems would be met by the enactment of the enclosed draft legislation which would reduce the noncash credit allowable with respect to publicly owned parking facilities by that portion of their total cost which is anticipated to be recovered from revenues."

Section 211, streets and other facilities only partly benefiting the project area: The General Accounting Office recommended to Congress a change in section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to clarify the minimum amount that a facility should benefit the project to be declared eligible as a noncash grant-in-aid. The GAO recommendation followed a finding that many of the facilities tentatively allowed by the Urban Renewal Administration as noncash grants-in-aid were actually ineligible, or the amount of credit allowed, based on the benefit to the project, has been excessive. The Urban Renewal Administration agreed with the GAO recommendation. This section would write the GAO recommendation into law.

Section 212, noncash local grants-in-aid; facilities financed with other Federal funds: At present, no part of a public improvement or facility that is financed by Federal funds or subsidy can be included in the local noncash grant-in-aid which is the local share of an urban renewal project. This section would provide for an exception in the case of the regular Federal payment to the District of Columbia.

Section 213, noncash local grants-in-aid; facilities constructed without notification or prior to Federal recognition of project: This section would provide that no public improvement or facility could be included as part of the noncash local grant-in-aid if it had been begun 3 or more years prior to Federal authorization for assistance to the urban renewal project, without notification to the administrator. In recent years, the purpose of allowing noncash local grants-in-aid has been distorted to the point where many cities pay very little in cash, and many of the projects allowed as noncash contributions to the local share of the project were started years prior to any thought of the use of urban renewal for the area. This section would set a 3-year limitation in place of the discretionary provisions now in the law.

Section 214, definition of local public agency: This section would provide that the local public agency involved in carrying out the local effort for urban renewal be directly responsible to the local or State government. At present, the local public agency is independently authorized by State statute, and too often does not work in harmony with the local government, and cannot be held responsible by the electorate.

Section 215, rehabilitation loans: This section would provide for an additional authorization of $250 million over a 2-year period for the Republican rehabilitation loan program begun last year. The loans are low-interest loans designed to help the tenants, homeowners, and small businessmen in urban renewal areas renew their own property rather than be subject to clearance. Although this program was cited by many from both sides of the aisle in the House and Senate debates on the Housing Act of 1964, and was praised by the President in signing the bill, and although the President this year has called for an additional effort in the area of rehabilitation and code enforcement, the Johnson administration has not requested any new authorization for this program.

This section would also provide a $5 million experimental program, out of the above authorization, for deteriorating areas not yet classified as urban renewal areas, using the same type of rehabilitation loan. These so-called gray areas, if acted upon early enough, could be prevented from turning into more serious problems. It is the intent of this section, coupled with other provisions of this bill, to fulfill the goals expressed by the House Banking and Currency Committee in its report on the Housing Act of 1964, when it said:

"The committee believes that this low-interest rehabilitation loan program, coupled with those provisions of this bill which strengthen and emphasize the role of code enforcement by the communities, and authorize urban renewal projects which consist entirely or substantially of a program of intensive code enforcement, can substantially assist in eliminating and preventing the development and spread of slums and blight without the use of urban renewal capital grant funds."

TITLE III—FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Section 301, FHA mortgage financing for veterans: This section would provide for a mortgage insurance program for veterans who have not used their eligibility under the GI program. The mortgages are limited to one-family residences, 100 percent of $20,000, and 85 percent of any value in excess of $20,000, up to the maximum of $30,000 for FHA insured mortgages. This would provide assurance that armed service personnel, now and in the future, would have their contributions recognized, in case the present program under the Veterans' Administration should continue to be phased out.

Section 302, mortgage insurance for housing in outlying areas: This section would provide for an increase in the amount that may be insured under section 203(i) of the National Housing Act from $11,000 to $15,000. It would extend to private enterprise the same insurance ceiling now available to the Farmers Home Administration. Section 203 (i) is the best section of those available under the Federal Housing Administration for financing rural homes. Industry is cooperating, but rural residents want and many can afford more house than can be built for $11,000.

The Farmers Home Administration's direct loans on nonfarm properties for nonfarmers average about $14,000, and are an expensive item in the Federal budget. By raising this artificial limitation, the resources of private enterprise can be put to work, providing greater assistance at lower cost. The original justification for the present limit was

that an extra one-half percent servicing fee was allowed. This fee is no longer permitted, but the ceiling has never been allowed to rise to a level where the program could be effective.

Section 303, general FHA mortgage insurance authorization: This section would provide FHA with a continuing right to insure up to the amount of insurance it has in force as of October 1, 1965. It contrasts with the present law which denies to FHA the right to insure after September 30, 1965. The latter provision was little noticed when proposed and passed in 1961. It was inserted into the Housing Act of 1961 in order to hold FHA hostage for other programs which do not have its widespread appeal and acceptance. The result is that if these other programs are not extended, then FHA is dead as well.

The agency, faced with a declining natural market for FHA insurance, but with a strong economic demand for its services, does not need additional authorization for its insurance program. What it can use is its present right to insure. At its present 30 year age, the mortgages being paid off every year are sufficient, if it is allowed to reuse the insurance retired for new risks, to keep it in business at the pleasure of Congress.

Section 304, mortgage insurance for low and moderate income families: This section would provide for an extension of the low and moderate income mortgage insurance program, under FHA, authorized in section 221(f) of the National Housing Act, from 1965 to 1967. It is of particular importance to continue this program in light of a need for a renewed emphasis on low and moderate income housing in urban renewal areas.

TITLE IV—OTHER FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

Section 401, college housing loans: This section would provide for a continuation of the successful college housing loan program at its present rate through 1966, and provide for a lowering of the interest rate. The present interest rate, pegged to the average cost of Government borrowing, has risen sufficiently since the enactment of this program to have a braking effect on the use of the program. The college housing need, however, continues, and rather than fall back on more costly Government grants, it is preferable to lower the cost of the loans to the institutions.

Section 402, direct loans to provide housing for the elderly and the handicapped: This section would provide for a continuation of a program which has received widespread bipartisan support. It would remove the dollar limitation on the funds available and substitute instead a cutoff date of June 30, 1969. As in the case of the college housing loans, the interest rate would be lowered, to eliminate the present practice of having the increased cost reflected in higher rents. This was obviously not the intent of Congress, and the lower interest rate will again allow a valuable program to continue without the need to substitute a more costly one in its place.

TITLE V—COMPENSATION OF CONDEMNEES

This title was first offered last year in the Republican housing proposals. It is a recognition of the fact that condemnation awards have not been sufficient for many displaced tenants and property owners. In particular, the small businessman has been inadequately assisted, contributing heavily to the average failure rate of 35 percent for those displaced by urban renewal. The few changes made last year were recognized by the Senate Housing Committee as being accepted on a trial basis pending the study by the Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Public Works Committee. A full review was promised in 1965. The subcommittee's staff report has been completed and published with the suggestion that other committees of Congress, according to their jurisdiction, should look into this field. No new legislation has been offered by the administration in this area.

This title now contains many suggestions of the staff study mentioned above, and they are noted in the section-by-section analysis. In addition, we have again proposed the use of replacement cost as a measurement of an equitable reward. It is the first comprehensive compensation legislation to be introduced in Congress. According to the Real Property Acquisition Subcommittee staff study, some 66,000 families and individuals, and 13,000 businesses, per year, will be displaced by urban renewal and other housing programs in the future. This is ample evidence of the need for further congressional action.

Section 501, declaration of policy.

Section 502, definitions.

Section 503, land acquisition policy.

This section would provide that, as a condition to Federal assistance, each applicant for Federal aid would be required to follow certain procedural practices relating to the acquisition of land or other property. These provisions include: a stress on negotiated settlement; prior appraisal and offer; compensation for damage to the remainder of the property, or the acquisition of the whole piece if the owner would be left with an uneconomic remnant; permission for the owner to remove the structures not needed by the authority; 180 days' notice prior to relocation; rental adjustments on acquired property reflecting loss in patronage; the elimination of the need for an owner to institute legal proceedings; a prohibition against stalling or other tactics to force a sale; and a requirement that the economic and social effects of dislocation be taken into account in determining project boundaries. These are the recommendations of the staff study for the Special Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition.

Section 504, assurance of compensation: This section would provide that, as a condition of Federal assistance, the applicant would agree to the compensation criteria of this bill.

Section 505, compensation: This section would provide for an owner of a property interest, including tenants, to have the higher of the actual value of the property interest taken, or its replacement cost.

Section 506, payment before eviction: This section would provide that each condemning authority would set aside 90 percent of their appraised value of the property to be taken for the use of the person entitled to the award within 15 days of the notice of taking. This would avoid the situation where the owner of a property interest might otherwise have to wait on a possible court settlement to receive his money, even though he would be forced to move in the meantime and incur large relocation costs. The owner of the property interest, in this new provision, would be relieved in many cases from the burden of borrowing in order to relocate, or the possibility of failure in the case of the small businessman without sufficient funds or credit.

Section 507, actual value: This section would define actual value of a property interest taken under eminent domain in the usual sense of the highest cash price it could reasonably bring in the marketplace. It would, however, provide that any increase or decrease in value as a result of the likelihood of the proposed project would not be considered. This would prevent land speculation, and protect the property owner whose property values could otherwise be reduced. It is a recommendation of the staff study for the Real Property Acquisition Subcommittee.

Section 508, expenses incidental to transfer of title: This section would provide for reimbursement to the owner of a condemned property the costs of any recording fees, transfer taxes, and similar expenses incidental to the transfer of title to the public agency, any penalty costs for prepayment of mortgages, and the prorata portion of property taxes for the period before the vesting of title. It is a recommendation of the staff study for the Real Property Acquisition Subcommittee.

Section 509, litigation expenses: This section would provide that an owner of property would be reimbursed for reasonable attorney's fees, appraisal and engineer fees, connected with a condemnation proceeding when the final judgment was for the owner on the question of the right to condemn, or where the proceedings were abandoned. A recommendation of the staff study.

Section 510, displacement by code enforcement for urban renewal project or voluntary rehabilitation under urban renewal plan: This section would provide for those displaced by code enforcement or voluntary rehabilitation projects under the Housing Act as amended last year by the Republican proposals to be deemed displaced persons for purposes of assistance. A recommendation of the staff study.

Section 511, replacement cost: This section would define replacement cost to be the entire cost of replacing a property interest, lost through condemnation, with an interest substantially similar.

Subsection (a) would provide that this award would include: The purchase price of real or personal property to reproduce the interest previously possessed; all moving expenses; rents, profits lost, and overhead expenses due to a suspension of the business; reinstallation of fixtures and equipment; reopening costs; attorney and broker fees; and duplication of taxes, interest, and rent.

Subsection (b) would provide for protection against an overly generous award in the case where property would be replaced by a substantially different interest.

Subsection (c) would provide for the case of damage to property or a portion of property being taken.

Section 512, taking and damage defined: This section would define taking to relate to any acquisition by eminent domain of a property interest in a whole or partial manner. It would define damage to relate to the net decrease in value of a property located adjacent to property acquired for a project, as a result of the project.

Section 513, requirements for approval of contracts or agreements for Federal financial assistance: This section would provide that no new contract for assistance would be entered into after July 1, 1966, without the agreement by the applicant to the procedural and compensation requirements of this act. Although the staff study for the Special Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, in their proposed legislation, provides for such a requirement, it does not have any leeway for the time needed to change certain State and local ordinances, where necessary. A minimum amount of time should certainly be allowed.

Section 514, enforcement: This section would provide for review of compliance and possible suspension of funds.

Section 515, application: This section would provide that nothing in this title would apply to any project contracted or planned for prior to enactment of this act.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 601, establishes the FHA as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government: This section would provide for the establishment of an independent FHA, divorced from its status as a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Administration. The powers of the Commissioner are transferred to a Board of Directors of the FHA, who are to be three in number with no more than two of whom

being of the same political party. Terms of office are set, and one of the three members, all named by the President and confirmed by the Senate, will act as chairman. The action of change is to take place within 90 days, after the enactment of this act.

FHA-insured mortgages are the backbone of the national mortgage market. Insured mortgages are the only truly effective device for channeling mortgage funds from credit surplus to credit short areas. FHA serves a broad range of income groups. In 1962, 48.6 percent of FHA mortgages on new homes were for people with incomes below $7,200 and 51 percent of its mortgages on existing homes were for people in this same income group.

FHA's ability to direct its efforts to the areas of maximum benefit, and to freely determine the actuarial soundness of its programs is restricted, so long as it is a part of a larger governmental organization more concerned with sociological and political problems than with finance. The housing amendments of 1955 recognized this problem for the Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and separated them from the HHFA.

FHA is financially independent—its sole function is the insuring of loans and all Government funds advanced to start it have been paid back with interest. All operations are conducted out of income from fees and insurance premiums. Reserves are adequate for a major disaster. FHA and HHFA budgets are not interdependent so no problems would be created. Administratively, FHA is presently self-sufficient.

FHA operations being well defined and the agency being financially self-sufficient, the problem of additional agencies reporting to the President would be nominal. The achievement of housing goals depends to a major degree on the enthusiastic participation of private capital which can best be achieved through an agency primarily oriented to the problems of the private capital market.

Section 602, establishment of the housing and renewal agency to administer jointly the public housing and urban renewal programs: This section would provide for the amalgamation of the present public housing and urban renewal agencies within the Federal Government's Housing and Home Finance Agency. The new Agency, to be known as the Housing and Renewal Agency, would promote economy and efficiency of operation. Both present Agencies employ numerous individuals performing the same functions, including the review of slum clearance reports, land acquisition in the field, relocation, and planning surveys. Their statistical analyses have the same purpose and relate to the same activities. Their land appraisers, auditors, engineers, building inspectors, fiscal experts, and lawyers have almost the same identical activities.

In the field, many of the local housing authorities of the FHA, and the local urban renewal agencies, operate under a single executive director and combine their operations. Many of the people working at the national and local level of URA have graduated to their present positions from the public housing field. In addition to the possibilities of ending the duplication of efforts in the specialty fields, economy and efficiency could be promoted by combining the executive, information, statistical, administrative, legal, general service, and allied departments.

The first part of the section, subsection (a), sets up the new Agency and its Commissioner.

Subsection (b) transfers all of the functions of the public housing and urban renewal agencies to the new Agency, and also provides that all laws relating to the old agencies, all agency regulations, and al regulatory or advisory groups presently operating shall continue in force or operation.

Subsections (c) through (e) pertain to conforming language.

Subsection (f) would provide for the section to take effect within 90 days of passage, the actual day to be determined by the HHFA Administrator and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who are provided with the necessary authority to carry out the purpose of the act.

Section 603, establishment of the Office of Urban Affairs: This section would provide for an Office of Urban Affairs in the Office of the President. It would provide an upgrading of the role of urban affairs, and establish a clearinghouse of information and coordination for the various programs within the Government departments, dealing with urban problems. It would provide a central point of access for State and local governmental officials seeking information and assistance.

Section 604, insurance of leases by the Small Business Administration: This section would provide for a Small Business Administration lease guarantee program to insure small business leasing opportunities in downtown areas. An insurance fund is established for leases running 10 years or less. In testimony to the House Special Subcommittee on Housing in the fall of 1963, the Urban Renewal Commissioner recognized the need, under questioning, for a program of this nature. Studies by the Small Business Administration and the House Special Committee on Small Business indicate that over 100,000 firms have been displaced by urban renewal by 1962, and another 100,000 or more will be displaced in the next 10 years. Without additional assistance, upward of 35,000 firms will never open their doors again following this displacement. With operational experience, this program could well be expanded to include firms locating outside of downtown areas.

Section 605, increase in insured amount of bank deposits and savings and loan accounts: This section would amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act so as to increase the maximum coverage of each depositor of an insured bank and each share account holder of an insured savings and loan association. The existing limit of $10,000 per account would be increased to $25,000. Officials of both the FDIC and the FSLIC have testified that such increases in insurance coverage safely could be made without increases in premiums for such insurance. The existing limit of insurance coverage was set 15 years ago when the insurance coverage was increased from $5,000 to $10,000 per account.

In the interval since, time deposits in banks and savings accounts in savings and loan associations have more than doubled and such savings have become of increasing importance to our national economy. The increased insurance coverage will encourage the public to further expand the portion of its assets held in savings accounts. This will be of particular importance to mortgage credit as we move into the prospective heavy housing demands that will face us in the latter part of this decade.

Section 606, FNMA secondary market operations: This section would provide authority for the Federal National Mortgage Association to deal in conventional mortgages. Purchases are limited to those mortgages which have outstanding balances of 80 percent or less of the appraised value of their respective properties. Purchases of mortgages insured under the National Housing Act are permitted, but not if they exceed 100 percent of the unpaid principal amounts, are held by States or municipalities or either's instrumentalities, or in excess of $17,500 per dwelling unit. In this last case, certain exceptions are made in the case of mortgages under section 220, or title VIII, or section 213, or properties in an urban renewal area, or properties in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii. This new authority would assist the market for both new and existing homes by increasing the marketability of mortgages, making them a more liquid and attractive investment.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there are no greater friends of liberty and justice in the free world today than the people of Greece. It is no accident that this is so. The people of Greece fought hard for their independence—for four centuries of foreign domination. Just 144 years ago today, a small band of Greek patriots raised the flag of liberty and declared their determination to be free.

The struggle for Greek independence in the early years of the 19th century won a great deal of support all over the world. This was particularly true here in the United States where our own political philosophers drew on the inspiration of Plato's call to excellence in leadership and Aristotle's insistence on a government of limited and divided powers.

President Monroe spoke for all America when he said in his annual message to Congress in 1821:

> Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural that their (the Greeks') contest should arouse the sympathy of the United States.

From my own State of Massachusetts came important American support for Greek independence. Edward Everett of Harvard entitled his oration for the degree of master of arts in 1814, "The Restoration of Greece." It was Everett who later assisted Daniel Webster in his famous statement on Greece delivered before the Congress.

This feeling of camaraderie with our Greek friends has increased over the years. Many Americans of Greek ancestry have contributed a great deal to our culture and our economy.

Shortly after World War II Greece met still another threat to liberty—from Communist guerrillas. At that time the heart of America again went out to the Greek people and our first major postwar military assistance went to Greece in that hour of need.

The wisdom of our support for Greece has been demonstrated time and time again as the Greek people have tried hard to bring about steady economic growth and social reform—in a framework of democratic respect for human dignity. They are succeeding and will continue to succeed, I am sure.

Our relations have remained close through the years and it is with great pleasure that I rise on the floor today to pay tribute to the noble heritage of the Greek people. We stand with them in

a true spirit of brotherhood and share their hope and ideal of a world at peace under justice.

INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL FLOWS AND INTEREST RATE DIFFERENTIALS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the debate over how to correct our chronic balance-of-payments deficit, considerable disagreement exists over the importance of interest rate differentials on international capital flows. Those who wish to continue an easy money policy at home generally insist that interest rate differentials between the United States and foreign nations have little effect on capital flows. Several Democratic members of the Joint Economic Committee argued this point during the Joint Economic Committee's recent hearings on the President's annual reports.

Personally, I believe the weight of economic evidence shows capital flows, particularly short-term flows, to be sensitive to interest rate differentials. If this is true, it would indicate that market-determined interest rates in the United States would help to keep funds at home, and, perhaps, even draw foreign funds into our country. This would mean a significant improvement in our balance of payments.

The bibliography below represents a listing of the serious studies published in recent years in the United States on the subject of international capital flows and interest rate differentials.

Only Bell's study offers significant general support for the position that there is little evidence that capital flows are very sensitive to international interest rate differentials and changes in these differentials. The Bell study, moreover, is older than several others on the list; it has been critically examined by Cohen and found wanting in several respects.

The position that capital flows are not interest sensitive seems somewhat doubtful as applied to short-term flows. Even Bell finds some sensitivity to interest rate differentials; the question is really one of degree. In his evaluation of these studies, Robert Roosa testified—on July 9, 1963, before the Joint Economic Committee—that he regarded the Cohen paper as the most useful and most up to date and that the volume of interest-sensitive flows is significant. One can really only counter this judgment by pointing out that the studies are not decisive in that the data are somewhat crudely classified while the number of factors influencing short-term capital flows is very large.

The situation is somewhat different, however, with respect to the interest sensitivity of long-term investment. The studies generally indicate that, at most, changes in rates and rate differentials affect the timing of borrowing—in other words, that, unless interest rate changes are reversed within a few months, long-term capital flows will not be deterred by higher rates in a lending country or encouraged by lower rates.

In addition to the studies listed, a brief summary of the Federal Reserve's view, as of December 1963, appears in the latest edition of the Federal Reserve System: Purposes and Functions, pages 158–160.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bell, Philip W., "Private Capital Movements and the U.S. Balance-of-Payments Position," in Factors Affecting the U.S. Balance of Payments. (Compilation of studies prepared for the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee, Washington, 1962), pages 395–482.

Cohen, Benjamin J., "A Survey of Capital Movements and Findings Regarding Their Interest Sensitivity," in the U.S. balance of payments, hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, July 1963 (Washington, 1963), pages 192–208.

Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, "How Sensitive to Interest Rates? Some Statistical Evidence," Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia Business Review, November 1962, pages 8–10.

Gemmill, Robert F., "Interest Rates and Foreign Dollar Balances," Journal of Finance, volume XVI (September 1961), pages 363–376.

Katz, Samuel I., "Yield Differentials in Treasury Bills, 1959–64," Federal Reserve Bulletin, October 1964, pages 1241–1260.

Kenen, Peter B., "Short-Term Capital Movements and the U.S. Balance of Payments," in the U.S. balance of payments, hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, July 1963 (Washington, 1963), pages 153–191.

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently corresponded with the Chairman of the State Department's Board of Foreign Scholarships, Mr. John M. Stalnaker, about the relationship between private and public educational exchange programs. The Board of Foreign Scholarships administers the Hays-Fulbright Act (Public Law 584). It came to my attention that in publications of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, and the related U.S. Advisory Commission on International Education and Cultural Affairs, the true relationship of public programs to private programs was not presented. Public programs of educational exchange, which represent at most an estimated 10 percent of all such programs, are presented as the crucial element without which private programs would either be impossible or ineffective.

Public educational exchange programs must be considered supplementary to private programs. The role of the public program must be to coordinate private programs, and provide additional services when needed. Their ultimate effect must be to stimulate and enrich private activity, rather than to smother it. We have all become aware of the extensive efforts of private educational, missionary and other private institutions in the field of international educational and cultural exchange—efforts which have in some cases existed for over 100 years.

I was heartened by Mr. Stalnaker's fundamental agreement with my views, and particularly by his statement in his February 8 letter to me that he hoped "the Board will use the theme of public and private programs for one or its future reports." I strongly endorse his suggestion. I have every confidence that such a report, based on suggestions in my March 24 letter, will be published.

Under unanimous consent I place this correspondence in the RECORD:

JANUARY 14, 1965.

Mr. JOHN M. STALNAKER,
Chairman, The Board of Foreign Scholarships, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STALNAKER: I recently received a copy of your publication, "Teacher and Scholar Abroad." I was extremely interested in this report and I have two questions concerning the role of your agency and the Federal Government as a whole in encouraging and implementing the exchange of students between the United States and other countries.

First of all, I am interested in how the 10 percent of all exchange students handled through this Federal-sponsored agency fit in with the other 90 percent of exchange students handled through private programs. What are the differences between the private and the Government programs? Is the Government-sponsored program supplemental? Does it work in the same areas—geographically and/or academically? On what levels do the two programs operate—secondary, college level, or both? What are the requirements for a student taking part in the Government program as opposed to the private programs?

Secondly, it appears that your report points up merely the advantages of student exchange in general, federally as well as privately sponsored programs. What I would like to know is if there are any advantages to one program rather than the other; public versus private? I would certainly appreciate any assistance which you might be able to give me in these matters.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
THE BOARD OF FOREIGN SCHOLARSHIPS,
February 1, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I appreciate the interest expressed in your letter of January 14, 1965, in our recent report, "Teacher and Scholar Abroad."

Before responding to your two questions specifically, I should note that the educational exchange program under the responsibility of the Board of Foreign Scholarships—a Presidentially-appointed public body—are funded and managed by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State. Overseas some 64 U.S. diplomatic missions and 48 binational boards or commissions, the latter established by executive agreements, in over 100 countries play a key role in insuring that the program serves the broad interests of the United States in its relations with other countries.

I can best answer your first question by saying that the Board's academic exchange programs—students, teachers, and professors—represent a small but highly selective part of the total flow of such exchanges to and from the United States. The foreign students, all college level but principally graduate students, include many who may be professionals in their own countries and not students, but who want the opportunity of graduate study in the United States. They probably differ most from those under private programs in the rigorous screening and selection process through which they go by our binational committees abroad, with considerable attention to priority fields of study.

Three-fourths of our foreign student awards are so-called "travel only" grants without which the student would be unable to accept scholarship and other assistance from American universities. In some parts of the world we offer a number of undergraduate grants to increase the flow of students from countries where few opportunities for study in the United States exist.

The U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs when asked by the Congress to appraise the effectiveness of this program expressed the view "that one of the most important signs of effectiveness of the program has been its catalytic effect—in bringing about significant changes in approaches, in stimulating development both abroad and in the United States." ("A Beacon of Hope," April 1963.)

The best answer I can offer to your second question is that the position which the United States holds in the world today really requires a continuing partnership of public and private effort in this field of activity. To my mind the question cannot be phrased as an "either" "or" proposition. The U.S. Advisory Commission concluded "that the educational and cultural exchange program has proved itself an essential part of America's total international effort."

I believe this Federal effort is essential not merely as a symbol of official interest, but in continuing to encourage private support for such activities in the national interest, and to do those few things which government can best do, including obtaining official support and recognition of the value of these programs by other governments.

I have enclosed a copy of "A Beacon of Hope," which may give you additional information on these questions. If I can be of further help please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. STALNAKER,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1965.

Mr. JOHN M. STALNAKER,
Chairman, Department of State,
The Board of Foreign Scholarships,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STALNAKER: Thank you very much for your responsive letter to the questions I posed about the overall efforts in our society in the teacher and scholar exchange programs with particular reference to the relationship of private programs to governmental programs.

I agree with your statement that the question cannot be phrased as an either or proposition and I am sorry if you so interpreted the purport of my questions. But I do believe it is important to decide whether the Government role is to be one of collaboration "effectively with the nongovernmental world," or one of "coordinating all international education and cultural activities" or one of supplementing and innovating "At another level conduct a program of its own. Not itself a specialized program * * *" but to "explore and open up many lines of interest some of which will prove worthy of more intensive exploitation by specialized agencies." I am quoting from the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs of April 1963, "A Beacon of Hope" (p. 55 and then page 60).

I think it is important to point up an ambiguity in the report of the Advisory Commission itself concerning the proper role of Government. On page 55 the sentences immediately preceding the quotation I set out, read "In a pluralistic society, the Government will not wish to control or coordinate the vast range of educational and cultural exchange activities carried on by the various private elements in the society. But it is essential that the Government collaborate effectively with the nongovernmental world." Yet, as I point out, on page 60, under the heading "The Role of CU," is the statement "CU's objectives must be understood at two levels. First of all, CU has the charge of assisting the Secretary of State in his responsibility for coordinating all international and cultural activities. It is the one agency that must never cease to look at the whole range of international educational and cultural programs, governmental and private; and never cease to ask itself what the role of Government should be in respect to that total range."

Now in order to coordinate, or collaborate, or supplement or innovate with intelligence one must have a broad grasp of the whole range.

In the booklet "Teacher and Scholar Abroad" there is a glaring failure to present the whole range. Only once is there a reference to the fact that the Government programs under discussion relate to only 10 percent of the whole range within the society and there are no specifics at all about the 90-percent activity. In fact, the rhetoric is such that the virtues of the whole range is attributed to the 10-percent governmental activity. The 10-percent figure is at some variance with the statement at the bottom of page 37 of "A Beacon of Hope" which refers to the State Department's exchange program as constituting "only about 5 percent of all foreign students on U.S. campuses." I think the two figures can be reconciled perhaps if the 10 percent referred to the State Department program and other governmental programs although it did not say so, or included foreign students in travel status rather than "on the U.S. campuses."

However, whether the State Department program is 5 percent and total governmental programs 10 percent, the fact remains that the bulk of the activity lies in the private sector and there is very little information even in "A Beacon of Hope" about the history, extent, variety, and quality of the private programs. What is particularly lacking in "A Beacon of Hope" is some estimate of the rate of growth of the private programs vis-a-vis the governmental programs historically and in the very immediate past.

I have called attention to a phenomenon which I have observed in other areas of endeavor in our society where Government and private endeavor meet, by reducing it to a corollary to Gresham's law. The Curtis corollary states "Government money drives out private money." It would be interesting to know whether the heavy movement of Government into the field of exchange students has fostered or hampered the rate of growth of the private sector and whether the rate of growth of our total activity has been enhanced or slackened. Government activity can be coordinated so that it minimizes its impact through the operation of the Curtis corollary; certainly with adequate study and wisdom Government can supplement and can innovate without having the Curtis corollary go into operation. Indeed, if the study and wisdom are superior, the supplementation and innovation can increase the activity in the private sector so the overall total in the society is increased. Perhaps this has been true in the field under discussion but at the present there seems to be insufficient information upon which to base a judgment.

However, pamphlets such as "Teacher and Scholar Abroad" are not designed to encourage further private activity. Indeed, the thrust is discouraging to private activity because the impression is fostered that Government is handling the job and certainly grabbing the laurels. Even "A Beacon of Hope" is written with the emphasis on the tail rather than the dog. It is very difficult to determine in all too many instances in the pamphlet whether the problems pointed up, or the progress noted, is in the whole range, or in the Government sector or in the private sector, or what the mix may be. This is in spite of the fact that in many instances the line of demarcation between private and governmental is the crucial matter.

Is I have remarked, I found no discussion of the rate of growth in either the Government or private programs. Some reference is made in respect to quality aspects and some reference to variety aspects * * * but there is no growth data of either improved quality or variety.

In fact, on page 8 of "A Beacon of Hope" I find this very disturbing statement. "The foreign affairs of the United States also include a program for exchange of persons * * * the extraordinary new dimension in the relationship of one country to another. This program was concerted as a direct effort of the American people to bring about mutual understanding between themselves and the people of the world. There has been nothing quite like this * * * a peaceable, sizable exchange of persons, carried on by a government on behalf of an entire people * * * in the whole history of human affairs."

Well, if the people were conducting this program themselves without Government help * * * and apparently the U.S. people have been * * * before 1949 * * * when the State Department first thought it important to collect data for Government activities in this area * * * it would seem that the first thing for the U.S. Government to do would be to call attention to this fact, not throw it into the shadows by this unwarranted boast about governmental activities. Furthermore, I believe the very commendable agreement made by the U.S. Government with China to have China utilize the indemnity moneys owed to the United States as the result of the Boxer Rebellion to send Chinese students to the United States for education was a more important first in this field.

Surely the idea of exchange students was not new * * * even though massive Government participation ("massive" to a 5- or 10-percent amount) might have been new. Cecil Rhodes caught the point by establishing the Rhodes scholars. So did the founders of the American University at Beirut, Yale in China, etc. * * * Indeed the full extent of our private educational, public health, and medical missionary programs which started with the first Western European colonization of this continent and have continued ever since, were all following out this basic philosophy.

The Institute of International Education was established 50 pears ago. This gives us a better perspective of what has been going on in this area.

I am quite pleased with many of the specific recommendations of the Advisory Commission, particularly those which point out the needed further emphasis on the private sector even though, paradoxically, they were contained in a pamphlet the overall thrust of which extended the other way. On page 8 the Commission lists "four rather remarkable characteristics impressed upon it by the American people who gave it shape" and yet it lists last the one which should be listed first, for emphasis; i.e., "Finally, it re-

lies in very large part on private participation and initiative * * * direct official involvement is kept to a facilitative minimum." But, I submit, is official involvement kept to the facilitative minimum when Government publications like "Teacher and Scholar Abroad" project the image of the Government programs with little or no reference whatever to the private programs which does not even mention that in the Government programs, "* * * for every dollar expended by the exchange program on foreign students, it is estimated that approximately $2 to $4 are put into the program by other * * * largely academic, agencies"? (p. 50.)

The Commission recommends the establishment of more field or regional selection centers under private auspices * * * like "the new centers which have recently come into being at the initiative of private organizations such as the African-American Institute and the Institute of International Education." (p. 38.) However, the Commission then concludes with a cart-before-the-horse suggestion, "Some sort of arrangements would have to be worked out so that these centers (which would be set up regionally rather than in every country) would complement and not usurp the functions of the local Bi-National Commissions already established or to be established." (p. 39.)

Shouldn't the thrust be the other way? That the Bi-National Commission should complement and not usurp the private centers already established or to be established?

I believe that Government's role should be to supplement and to innovate so that the growth in the basic program, the private program, is encouraged and not stifled. More activity, a better quality activity, being more on a people-to-people basis, and a more varied activity should result.

Now if this is correct theory, the Government must publish its reports of its activities in proper context by giving to the private sector its proper encomiums, and its share of the criticism. Reports like "Teacher and Scholar Abroad" result in firming up the misconception already existing in the public mind about the student exchange programs that they consist principally of the "Fulbright scholarships."

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

THE BOARD OF
FOREIGN SCHOLARSHIPS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I appreciate very much your recent thoughtful letter about public and private academic exchange programs. I delayed my response until I had the opportunity to show your letter to several members of the Board of Foreign Scholarships at our spring meeting just concluded. I have also sent copies of the letter to the Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs and to the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs because your comments touch on their programs and responsibilities.

The Chairman of the Advisory Commission may wish to comment specifically on the numerous references in your letter to their report, "A Beacon of Hope." The Department of State may have other comments on the coordination of public efforts with private programs—a responsibility assigned to the Assistant Secretary of State.

I know of no member of our Board who would not agree with your observation "that the Government's role should be to supplement and to innovate so that the growth in the basic program, the private program, is encouraged and not stifled." This Board and its predecessors have been guided by this principle since the initiation of these programs in the late 1940's.

In publishing "Teacher and Scholar Abroad" we did not intend to report on the entire range of public and private programs—important as these are. Nor did we intend to leave the impression that the activities of the Board of Foreign Scholarships represent the entire effort in this field, or even a major part of the effort.

We sought rather to fulfill a more limited function prescribed in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961: Reporting annually to the Congress on the program under the Board's jurisdiction, and reporting "to the public in the United States and abroad to develop a better understanding of and support for the programs authorized by this act." We felt that the theme—"first person reports of the U.S. exchange program"—was a timely one to illustrate the diversity of these exchanges in the words of the participants. This aspect has not been publicized heretofore.

I am hopeful that the Board will use the theme of public and private programs for one of its future reports. Let me thank you again for writing at length about this. Your views are appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. STALNAKER,
Chairman.

MARCH 24, 1965.

Mr. JOHN M. STALNAKER,
Chairman, the Board of Foreign Scholarships, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STALNAKER: Thank you for your reply to my letter of February 8, 1965. I am encouraged that you and Mr. Gardner agree with my view that the role of Government is to supplement and innovate so that growth in our fundamental educational exchange program, the private program, is encouraged, not stifled.

I am particularly pleased with your comment in the last paragraph of your letter that you hope "the Board (of Foreign Scholarships) will use the theme of public and private programs for one of its future reports." I would also recommend that this theme be used in a future report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

It seems essential to me that, in fulfilling your organization's statutory requirement to report to Congress and the public, the true scope of public versus private educational exchange programs be made clear. As we are both aware, public programs account for only 10 percent of activity in the educational exchange area.

Such a publication should answer the questions I posed in my letter to you on January 14: what are the differences between private programs and the Government program; is the Government-sponsored program supplemental or does it work in the same areas—geographically and/or academically; on what educational levels do the two programs operate—secondary, collegiate, or both; what special requirements are there for Government-sponsored students compared to private program requirements?

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Messrs. Gardner and McPherson and sending copies of our full correspondence to Representatives BOLTON and ADAIR. I will also place our correspondence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, it is part of the nature of man to seek out the fatherhood of the good things he sees about him. We speak of George Washington as the father of his country. We speak of Einstein as the father of the atomic age.

It is interesting, therefore, in seeking such fatherhood, to note how frequently we end up with the name of a great Greek. Pythagorus is the father of mathematics. Euclid is the father of geometry. Homer is the father of epic poetry. Aeschylus is called the father of the drama. Aristophanes is called the father of comedy. Phidias is called the father of sculpture. Herodotus is the father of history.

The list is indeed endless. In whatever field we work, be it art or science, mathematics or music, philosophy or sculpture—the Greeks were there and were great. It is said of Alexander the Great that once when he was visiting the philosopher Diogenes, he remarked: "If I were not Alexander, I would wish to be Diogenes." All of us could well wish to bear the names that have come down like beacons through the centuries: [redacted]-rates, Plato, Aristotle—or even the first great woman poet of all time: Sappho.

So, on this day, when we celebrate the independence of Greece, we are celebrating the independence of not merely a nation, but of a whole civilization that may well be called the cornerstone of the modern world. It would be the greatest triumph for America if, 2,500 years from now, men would say that we gave to the world a greatness equal to that which was given by the Greeks.

The independence of Greece was not won at a small price. For more than four centuries Greece had labored under the oppressive burden of Turkish conquest. On an average of once every 11 years the Greek people had risen against the Turks, only to have their hopes drowned each time in a tide of blood and destruction. But on March 25, 1821, a small band of Greek patriots once again raised the flag of revolution against the Turkish conquerors, and once again a war for independence was started.

They pledged, as they raised this flag, that they would have liberty or death. For many, it was death. There was little interest in the capitals of Europe in this fight for freedom. Turkey was the sick man of Europe, and the strength of Turkey in the balance of power in Europe was more important than the freedom of Greece. The Greeks were, in the words of Chesterton, "countless, voiceless, hopeless." They were deserted by the nations that should have come to their help. They were facing the power of the Ottoman Empire. They were without arms, without armament. No sane man would ever dream that they could succeed. But they succeeded.

The nations of the world would not help. But the people of the world were

profoundly moved by the struggle. Byron died in the swamps of Greece, trying to lend his hand to the fight. Americans were moved by the conflict, because their own freedom was still fresh with them. So moved were they by the oratory of Edward Everett, professor of Greek at Harvard University, that President Monroe, in his annual message to Congress, cited the glories of Greece and affirmed the sympathy of the entire United States with the Greeks in their fight for liberation.

Slowly, inexorably, the weight of civilized thinking swung toward the Greek war for independence. Slowly the conscience of the world awakened, and as the conscience awakened, so, too, did the nations. The sight of these people fighting against the great Turkish Empire became too much even for the alliances of Europe. And when the nations of Europe finally spoke with power, Greece became a free country once again. In 1829 the terrible war came to an end. In 1830, Great Britain, France, and Russia solemnly declared that they would guarantee the independence of the Kingdom of Greece.

It is, therefore, with great delight and with no small pride that I take this occasion to recall the history of the struggle for Greek independence. I am delighted that this nation, truly called the father of our civilization, is still among the roster of free nations. I am proud that America, though small at that time, was still big enough to stand by the Greeks in their hour of desperation.

But above all I would point out the continuing richness of the contributions of Greece to our world. Twice she was at our side during the two World Wars fought in this century. Our soldiers and her soldiers fought to save the world from cruel Nazi slavery. And all over America today the sons and daughters of Greece will take time today to remember the home whence they came, or their fathers, or their grandfathers. They will remember her not as one long since dead, but as a living and vibrant nation still giving the richness of her art, her literature, her philosophy to the world. They will remember her as Poe once remembered Helen:

> On desperate seas long wont to roam,
> Thy hyacinth hair, thy classic face,
> Thy naiad airs have brought me home
> To the glory that was Greece,
> And the grandeur that was Rome.

PLACING FIRST-, SECOND-, AND THIRD-CLASS POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE MERIT SYSTEM

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which I have long felt has been needed. The bill is designed to take all postmaster appointments of the first, second, and third classes out of politics and place them under the civil service merit system.

The Postmaster General, rather than the President, would make the appointments of postmasters on the basis of competitive examinations. Under the bill I have introduced, Senate confirmation would not be required; in fact, no political test or qualification would be permitted.

It is my strong belief that the present method of using postmasterships as political patronage severely weakens the postal system. For example, a clerk with long and efficient experience and genuine ability does not have an opportunity for promotion to postmaster unless he has the proper political clout. I am aware of situations in some States whereby postmasters are regularly appointed and soon fired because of the changing political picture in these States. In other cases, postmasters have been serving for years under "temporary" or "acting" status. This is so because the politicians cannot come to agreement on a permanent appointment. In places where this kind of a situation takes place, the morale of employees is low and service is often correspondingly low.

If the civil service merit system has value, and I believe that it has, I see no reason why it cannot be applied in the case of postmaster appointments. The adoption of this system will enable us to attract the most able persons into postal service and will introduce a certain professionalism into the service. These definite plus factors, combined with others, more than justify legislation of the kind I suggest.

EDUCATIONAL TAX BENEFITS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill which I previously introduced in the 88th Congress.

This bill has widespread support across the Nation and, I believe, here in the Congress. It provides that the head of a household may deduct from his income tax a percentage of costs paid for higher education by the immediate members of his family. The bill also considers educational costs of part-time students and makes adjustments for scholarships and educational allowances.

This kind of legislation is much more meaningful than much of the talk we hear today about tax cuts. An allowed deduction for educational expenses should serve as a stimulus to higher learning, too.

This kind of legislation is of special importance to lower income families, as it provides for greater percentage deductions for those with lesser gross incomes.

Finally, this legislation is long overdue. It is my hope that the House will take the initiative in passing and implementing it in this 89th Congress.

IF YOU CAN GET THE MONEY, RISE ABOVE PRINCIPLE

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on this day when so many seem to be willing to rise above principle in order to get their hands in the Federal till at any cost, I am reminded of an editorial published in the Columbus Dispatch, way back in 1960.

The so-called "education bill" then was not nearly as atrocious as the monstrosity being foisted on the American people today. Goodbye local control; here comes more Washington bureaucracy.

The editorial follows:

NEA'S HEART IS WHERE THERE'S MOST MONEY

In a report entitled "What Everyone Should Know About Financing Schools," the National Education Association reveals with startling frankness that its heart is where the money is. The NEA is going after that Federal money with a vengeance.

Dr. John K. Norton, professor emeritus of Teachers College, Columbia University, author of the report, states his case this way:

1. Most school money (56 percent) comes from that level of government—the locality—which is "weakest" in ability to raise tax revenues.

2. Most of the remainder of the school support (40 percent) comes from the States, which is second in taxing ability.

3. Only a "pittance" (4 percent) comes from the Federal Government which he describes as "by far the most effective source of tax revenue (raising 69 percent of all taxes)."

To questions such as "Does not all revenue come from the same source, the pockets of the people? Why send it to Washington and then back?" Dr. Norton replies:

"These questions disregard the key issue. The relevant factor is that when Congress sees the need for revenue, it is not plagued by the fears that beset State legislatures and local fiscal bodies.

"State and local governments cannot consider need for revenue solely on the basis of the value of the public undertaking involved. Rather, they hesitate to extend their taxing systems for fear of placing their communities or States at a competitive disadvantage relative to other areas, even when the funds are for an undertaking as productive as good schools."

What the NEA report is saying here is that Congress should take over the public schools because the voters in a school district cannot be depended upon to provide as much money as Congress has the potentiality of providing.

If the NEA thesis is correct, then let us do away with all local governments and look to Congress for all funds to operate cities, villages, townships, counties, and State governments, as well as school districts. The voters, it seems, take too many things into consideration when they vote on local levies—what it will cost them and what they will get for their money, for instance.

Under the pressure of powerful lobbies, such as the NEA, Congress could find something new to tax, or go into debt, or start up the printing presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and thus finance the schools, because the people do not cast direct votes on these propositions as they do when they vote local school levies and approve local bond issues. Such would seem to be the reasoning of the NEA.

Apparently, the theme of the NEA is "Let's take school financing out of the hands of the people and place it in the hands of a Federal bureaucracy with virtually unlimited funds at its disposal."

The superior tax-collecting procedure inherent in the Federal Government, Dr. Norton says, has found it possible to support highways, housing, agriculture, hospitals, welfare, and a $40 billion defense budget—so let's toss in the schools.

If the time ever comes when the people of the cities and villages, school districts and townships are answerable to the NEA superstatists for operating the public schools, public education as Americans have known it will be at an end. It will be vested in Washington bureaucracy. The voters—the people at home—will have lost control of the schools to which they send their children.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Byelorussia. I am pleased to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute on this occasion to the brave Byelorussians whose short period of freedom was cut short by the Bolshevik forces of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government which now rules the Byelorussian people certainly does not represent their wishes or hopes, but merely serves as an instrument of oppression. Thus, the Byelorussian people suffer in the same manner as the other captive peoples of communism under a cruel dictatorship.

May I take this opportunity to commend the many Americans of Byelorussian origin who continue to strive for the eventual restoration of freedom for their homeland.

This anniversary serves as a reminder that the spirit of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the Byelorussian people behind the Iron Curtain and that the desire for independence and self-government continues to be the greatest weakness of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, may I again emphasize to the Members of the House the importance of establishing a special House Committee on Captive Nations in order to call to the attention of the world the cruel oppression under which the Byelorussian and other captive nations of communism suffer.

Since I, myself, am descended from immigrants who came to the United States from Poland, I have maintained a special interest in the peoples of areas adjacent to the land of my forebears. The heroic people of Byelorussia have been extremely effective in maintaining their spirit and determination in the face of Communist oppression. We must not permit their spirit and determination to be in vain.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians constitute one of the important group of Slavic peoples in Eastern Europe. Their historic homeland borders Poland on the west, Lithuania on the northwest, the Ukraine on the south, and Russia proper on the east. In this relatively large expanse of more than 80,000 square miles they have lived throughout their known history. During the late Middle Ages they formed a sovereign state of their own, held their destiny in their own hands, and developed their own distinct civilization. Long before the emergence of modern Russia they thus had their own independent state.

For centuries these rugged people had been subjected to the oppressive regimes of the czars, whose tyrannical governments tried hard to wipe out all national feeling among these people. Fortunately their agents did not succeed in this task, and in the end Byelorussian national spirit won out. When the regime in Russia was overthrown, the Byelorussians became free. Early in 1918, on March 25, they proclaimed their national independence. That memorable date marked the rebirth of the new Byelorussia, ushering in a new era for its people.

Regretfully, however, the freedom and independence thus regained proved temporary and shortlived. Before these unhappy people had time to strengthen their new state, it was attacked by the Red army, completely overrun, and by mid-1919 Byelorussia was annexed by the Soviet Union.

Since then these people have been almost submerged and lost in the huge Soviet empire. Isolated and separated from the West by hundreds of miles, they have been completely at the mercy of their Soviet overlords. For more than four decades they have not known freedom. During the last war they had hopes of attaining freedom and independence, but all their hopes were shattered by the devious designs of Soviet authorities. Thus they have less freedom today than they had during the interwar years, but they have not given up their hopes for eventual freedom. On this 47th anniversary of their independence day let us all pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 2362.

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

There was no objection.

STEERING COMMITTEE, INTEREST RATES, AND THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, my name is WRIGHT PATMAN, Democratic Representative from the First District of Texas. For 36 years, I have been a controversial Congressman. This has been of my own choosing.

It would have been relatively simple for me to avoid much of the controversy that has been attracted to me. All I would have had to do would have been to fight the good fight for the overdog. When you do this, it is possible to accumulate all kinds of plaudits—honorary degrees from great universities, press acclaim, approval of your every action by those lobbies whose chief reason for existing is to aid their special interest at the expense of the American people.

I admit that I, too, have had a special interest. It is to pass good legislation. Good legislation to me is that which serves the people well. Good legislation has durability.

EXAMPLE OF GOOD, DURABLE LAW

Take the case of a law that was passed over 45 years ago, the one that says long-term Government securities shall not bear interest exceeding 4.25 percent. This law has served the American people so well that they have been able to go through two of the most horrendous wars in all history—the most devastating, worldwide depression in all history—and here and there a brush-fire war to boot—all without the need for breaking this 4.25-percent ceiling on long-term Government securities.

Now there is a concerted campaign on the part of the banking lobby and its handmaiden, the Federal Reserve System, to increase interest rates, which would result in puncturing this 4.25-percent ceiling that has done so well by us for nearly half a century. Should this ceiling become only history, we can forget all about moving in the direction of the Great Society so nobly envisioned by my friend, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

If the banking lobby succeeds in its blind ignorance and ruthless drive toward upping interest rates on Government securities above 4.25 percent, then we may be sure that there will be an acceleration of the present trend toward higher interest rates on all types of loans.

HISTORY OF HIGH INTEREST

Historically, high interest rates mean trouble. In a newspaper article that I wrote for United Press International,

published last Sunday, I noted that Solon, the Athenian lawmaker, forbade men being sold into slavery because of unpaid interest charges.

I have studied a great deal of the history of money and interest, which for so long was called usury. I learned that the lending of money at interest was outlawed by both the Jewish and Christian churches for over a thousand years.

In the 10th century, under King Alfred, laws were enacted which provided that all the effects and lands of those who loaned money at interest would be forfeited to His Majesty.

And during the reign of Henry II, in the 12th century, those who loaned money at interest not only had to forfeit their estates to the King, but their children were disinherited.

Right here and now I want to go on record as opposing any legislation so drastic.

Two hundred years later in the 14th century, the crime of loaning money at interest became a capital offense. Again I wish to state that the punishment is too severe.

Now let us go to the year 1693, when the treasury of England was empty. It was during the reign of King William III, who was carrying on a war against France's Louis XIV. He needed money in the worst way—$5 million worth, so he went to the goldsmiths. It so happened that during this period, corruption was general in England and the goldsmiths, who were the lenders of money, had become fabulously rich at high interest rates. They pursued a policy of loaning up to 10 times the amount of gold they actually possessed. They issued receipts for gold which was not in their vaults.

It is a fact that I have stated on the floor of the House many times—our present banking system permits banks to issue credit at approximately the same ratio today, that is, 10 times the amount of dollars they have in reserve. This puts them in a favored class and gives them privileges which should never be abused.

To propagandize and lobby and connive to secure higher interest rates now, when the banking community is making more profit than ever before in its history, is most certainly an abuse of the privilege bankers now enjoy.

LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT'S INTEREST UP, EVERYTHING UP

The bellwether of all interest yields centers upon how much Uncle Sam pays for his long-term paper. Raise the yield and the cost of all money goes up, credit becomes tight, everybody rushes for a storm cellar and the cruel wind of economic restriction blows over the land. Then there is no growth to the economy. Then there are higher unemployment figures. Moreover, the Government is forced to operate at a greater deficit to keep disaster from getting altogether out of hand.

APPEAL TO DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS

It is my feeling that there is not a man on the floor of this House, be he Republican reactionary or modern Democrat, who wants anything like this to happen. That is why I am appealing directly to the Democratic Members of the Congress to join with more than 70 of our colleagues who are already signed up for a steering committee to hold long-term Government securities within the 45-year-old 4.25-percent ceiling. These Members come from over 30 States. Now I am going to ask that every State in the Union be represented, because this should be truly a national crusade. The people in the South and West are paying higher interest rates than those in the East. Nonetheless, up will go all rates if the crime of eliminating the 4.25-percent ceiling is successful.

I do not believe my colleagues on either side of the aisle want financial and economic disaster to fall upon the American public. I think that many of the bankers back home are willing to let well enough alone. I believe that the drive is sparked by the concentrated money interests, mostly in New York, who are venal enough to insist upon killing the goose that lays the golden egg.

As I indicated in that United Press article alluded to a moment ago, the banking lobby has used our gold outflow and imbalance of payments as a pretext to increase interest rates. I now learn that our retiring Secretary of the Treasury, in remarks before a recent monetary conference of the American Bankers Association, rejected the use of a tighter monetary policy to help the Nation reduce its deficit. He stated that:

> We could not expect moderately tighter monetary policies to bring the needed reduction in the outflow of long-term funds abroad.

And that a tight money policy would surely be "self-defeating."

The outgoing Secretary said:

> Before it could achieve the interest rate objective, the extreme restriction of credit would surely move us toward domestic recession.

WELCOME TO NEW TREASURY SECRETARY

Now we have a gentleman from Virginia, Henry Fowler, as the new Secretary of the Treasury. I rather doubt that he would want a tight money, higher interest rate policy that would bring about the end of our contemporary prosperous period. I am certain one of his goals is not to implant a depression so long as he is Secretary of the Treasury. I have a feeling that he understands how disastrous increasing the 4.25 percent ceiling would be to our economy.

WHO CONTROLS MONEY POLICY

It is a sad fact, however, that neither the Secretary of the Treasury, nor even the President of the United States, really has control of the money policy of our country. As the Members of this House know, as chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I have a bill pending which embodies the recommendations of the majority of our Domestic Finance Subcommittee of 1964, which called for a modernization of the Federal Reserve System. Such modernization would mean an end to the dominance of the entire Federal Reserve System by the New York banks through their control of the New York Federal Reserve Bank.

In effect it would mean an end to the fraudulent independence of the Federal Reserve System. As countless top economists, such as Seymour Harris and John Galbraith, have pointed out, the Fed is not independent from the banking clique who have so long controlled the money system of America to the detriment of the people.

For the long pull, I want you gentlemen to think of the need of restoring the monetary policy of the country to the Congress, the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, instead of to a few believers in the divine right of money kings, including some of the kings themselves, most of whom reside in New York.

LET'S HOLD THE LINE

Today, though, I want you to center your thought on the need for holding the line on these long-term Governments, so that Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve System, and Alfred Hayes, head of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and the rest of the ruling clique, and the lobby of the American Bankers Association, are not able to get away with the monetary mayhem they are trying to perpetrate.

Let us hold the line. Let us reverse the trend toward higher and higher and higher interest rates, which if not checked can suffocate the American people. Come along, join up with the steering committee. Serve your people back home, who do not wish to be suffocated with high interest charges. Do not permit them to be victims of usury as existed in the dark ages, or as exists today in those nations which have a few rich and many poor.

ADVANCE WITH L.B.J.

Do you really want to advance with Lyndon Baines Johnson toward a great society? Then come along with those of us who are working toward a sound American money policy based on adequate credit—you note I said adequate credit and not easy money—for the legitimate needs of American businessmen, both small and large, and the personal needs of any American who requires credit at reasonable rates. With a sound fiscal and monetary policy, the Great Society is an authentic possibility. Without such a policy, the goal can never be reached.

I wish to announce that I have asked the President to meet with our steering committee so that we may reassure him that we, like the President, are in favor of no increase in interest rates, particularly on long-term Government securities. As I have indicated, there can be no Great Society unless we have a monetary policy that takes care of an expanding economy. I would like nothing better than to go with my fellow Democrats from 50 States for a White House visit for the purposes I have just mentioned:

THE 89TH CONGRESS—UNOFFICIAL STEERING COMMITTEE OF HOUSE DEMOCRATS TO OPPOSE ANY INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES ON LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT BONDS AS OF MARCH 19, 1965

Alaska: Rivers.
Arizona: Udall.
Arkansas: Trimble.
California: Brown, Burton, Cameron, Corman, Dyal, Edwards, Hanna, Hawkins,

Holifield, Moss, Roosevelt, Roybal, Sisk, Van Deerlin, and Wilson, C. H.
Delaware, McDowell.
Florida: Pepper.
Georgia: Mackay, Stephens, and Weltner.
Hawaii: Matsunaga and Mink.
Idaho: White.
Illinois: Annunzio and O'Hara.
Indiana: Madden.
Iowa: Hansen and Schmidhauser.
Maryland: Friedel.
Massachusetts: O'Neal.
Michigan: Diggs and Griffiths.
Minnesota: Karth and Olson.
Missouri: Sullivan.
Montana: Olsen.
New Jersey: Daniels, Krebs, McGrath, Minish, Rodino, Thompson, and Helstoski.
New York: Bingham, Ottinger, Resnick, and Ryan.
Ohio: Ashley, Gilligan, and Vanik.
Oklahoma: Johnson and Steed.
Oregon: Green and Ullman
Pennsylvania: Barrett, Dent, Holland, Nix, and Rhodes.
Rhode Island: St Germain.
South Carolina: Dorn and Gettys.
Tennessee: Evins.
Texas: Gonzalez, Patman, and Wright.
Washington: Meeds.
West Virgina: Kee.
Wisconsin: Kastenmeier and Reuss.
Seventy-two Members from 31 States.

Following is a list of only several instances among many indicating that money is tightening and interest rates rising generally and causing tremendous pressures on the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds:

First. In the 6 weeks from the first half of January 1965 to the second half of February 1965, the money supply has declined steadily from $160.1 billion to $158.8 billion. This represents a decline of over $1.3 billion, or an annual rate of decline of 6.5 percent. In contrast, the money supply from July 1963 to mid-January 1964 increased at an annual rate of 6.2 percent. During the depression period July 1957 to July 1960, the rate of growth of the money supply averaged less than 1 percent a year as interest rates were increasing.

Second. The interest rate on short-term Treasury bills has reached a market yield of just under 4 percent, the highest in 5 years. Our taxpayers are paying an additional $600 million in interest costs on the national debt due to this unnecessary short-term rate boost just since 1961. And, just since the end of 1963 to the present, the interest rate on 91-day Treasury bills has increased more than 20 percent. Since 1946 the interest rate on this class of Government securities has increased by 900 percent.

Third. The market for municipal issues is sluggish due to monetary tightening, according to the New York Times. Typical of such issues are Georgia school bonds, Florida school bonds, Ft. Worth, Tex., bonds, University of Rhode Island bonds, Utica, Mich., school bonds, and the Public Housing Administration bonds. Other recent examples of higher borrowing costs to municipalities are Prince Georges County, Md., bonds, Fairfax County, Va., bonds, and Fresno, Calif., bonds. The excess interest payable over the lives of these bonds amounts to many millions of dollars.

Fourth. Mortgage rates, too, rose slightly in January on loans not backed by the Government. The average rate for mortgages on new homes was 5.79 percent in January, up from 5.76 percent in December and 5.75 percent in November. All this points to tightening credit for long-term borrowings, according to Finance Week magazine.

Fifth. The Wall Street Journal in a recent article headlined, "Bankers Quietly Begin Raising Loan Charges on a Selective Basis," reports that several large banks are not heeding President Johnson's request to keep borrowing costs stable. The article adds that "term loans at the prime rate rapidly are becoming a thing of the past."

Sixth. Last November 24, the Federal Reserve Board raised the discount rate which member banks must pay on borrowings from the Federal Reserve from 3½ to 4 percent.

Seventh. Yields on 26-week Treasury bills are also up.

Eighth. The Federal National Mortgage Association has been forced to raise the interest rate it pays on short-term discount notes.

Ninth. The rates charged by finance companies on commercial paper have steadily risen recently.

Tenth. The 4¼-percent 1987–92 Treasury bonds, bellwethers of the money market, have been selling below par, thus in fact exceeding the 4¼-percent interest ceiling.

Eleventh. The average free reserves of our commercial banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System have been drastically reduced to a much lower level than the average level for the year 1964.

Twelfth. The Federal funds market has been trading at 4 percent and even higher because of the scarcity of bank reserves.

Thirteenth. Housing starts in 1965 are down substantially from the comparable period in 1964. This softness in the housing market may be traceable to higher interest costs on home mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

OPENING OF HOUSING LEGISLATION HEARINGS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement I made before the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee this morning.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania, chairman, began a series of hearings on the housing and urban development bill of 1965.

It is my feeling that this legislation, which I was privileged to introduce as H.R. 5840, will be a milestone in housing measures—ranking with the housing bills of 1949, 1954, and 1961 in opening new approaches for attacking our housing and urban development problems. While Congress as a body can enact legislation for better housing throughout this country, it is also our obligation to make certain that there is an adequate money supply available at reasonable interest rates to take advantage of any new dynamic program. It would be useless, for example, to enact legislation providing for new vistas of public housing while at the same time allowing interest rates on money used to finance these projects to reach such a height that it is economically unsound to borrow these funds. I am including in the RECORD a copy of my introductory remarks at the opening of the hearings of the subcommittee this morning:

INTRODUCTORY SPEECH BY CHAIRMAN WRIGHT PATMAN BEFORE HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1965, ON THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT BILL xxxxxxxx

Today the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee is beginning very important extensive hearings on H.R. 5840, the 1965 housing bill, which I introduced, and an identical bill, H.R. 5841, introduced by Chairman BARRETT. This bill is the administration's proposal. Dr. Weaver and his top staff from the Housing and Home Finance Agency will be our leadoff witnesses. We want to welcome you all back with us. This is a bill of great national importance, and we want to get the informed ideas and opinions of just as many persons and groups as we can before the committee acts on it.

I have had the privilege of working on many housing bills throughout my years in Congress. I speak from experience when I say that we have the opportunity this year to enact a bill which will be a milestone—ranking with the housing bills of 1949, and 1954, and 1961 in opening new approaches for attacking our housing and urban development problems.

The President has again shown that he understands the scope and urgency of this country's needs and that he sees them in terms not just of statistics but of people. This is a bill for all our citizens, including those in our cities, suburbs, and rural areas. The bill makes, for example, special provision for rural housing. It provides new programs for basic sewer and water facilities and for mortgage insurance for land development, which will be of special importance in the suburbs and other rapidly-growing areas.

This is a good bill as it is presented to us. I think, however, that we can make it an even better one. I hope and expect that all of us on the committee, on both sides of the table, can work together to shape a bill that will deserve, and will obtain, truly bipartisan support.

There is one area that I myself am going to be especially concerned with in considering this housing legislation. That is the question of interest rates. We are already paying more than $5 billion a year too much on the national debt because of precipitous interest rate increases during the 1950's.

INTEREST RISE DAMAGES PROGRAMS

The rise in interest charges since we passed the Housing Act of 1961 has already destroyed much of what the Congress hoped to accomplish through that bill. The most important provision in the 1961 Housing Act was the new 221(d)(3) program, designed to make reasonable interest-rate financing available so that housing could be provided

for displaced and other low- and moderate-income families at rentals they could afford. The program interest rate then was 3⅛ percent; now it is 3⅞ percent, and I understand that it will shortly be going up to 4⅛ percent. A 1-percent increase may not sound like a very important change, but it makes over a $10 difference in the monthly rent that a typical low-income family has to pay under the program. This amount to these people is a lot of money.

The same thing has happened in other housing and public facilities loan programs. The program of housing for the elderly we started in 1959 is almost at a standstill. In the college housing program the interest rate will shortly be a full 1¼ percent higher than the rate we provided by special legislation in 1955. These programs are important for the whole country—from Texarkana College in my district to a moderate-income housing project in New York. I don't want the people we have been trying to help through these programs to think that we have joined forces with the banking interests.

We have heard all kinds of new and old excuses raised in the past several years attempting to justify why we must have a high-interest rate structure in our country. The shopworn arguments of inflation is just around the corner, the balance-of-payments problems—these and other reasons—have been given why we have to jack up interest rates. Not a one of these reasons has any basis in fact. We do know, however, in the specific instance of housing legislation that these programs have severely suffered from the increase in interest rates over the past several years.

EXHAUSTED ALL EXCUSES

In my opinion, we have more than run out of excuses for not making available adequate financing at reasonable interest rates for our housing and urban development loan programs. There can be no valid excuses for refusing to help through housing legislation, our colleges, our low-income families, our small towns needing public works projects, and the other programs under the broad umbrella of our housing laws in this country.

There are other important questions which the committee should look into and explore. Among them they include the following:

1. Why are mortgages—VA and FHA in many instances now selling below par? There is no reason why these mortgages, backed by the full credit of the Federal Government, should be selling below par. It is obvious that the flow of savings going into mortgages will not be as great as long as mortgage paper is selling at a loss. How can this be prevented? How can those who have invested in this paper be assured of repayment at 100 cents on the dollar, as we did at one time with Government securities? How can we make sure that the greatest amount of funds necessary flows into this vital field of housing, and those who through purchase of life insurance and other investments are not penalized by having to sell mortgages at a loss?

This is a vital matter, and one which I trust the committee, staff, and witnesses will speak to during these hearings.

2. Another matter of vital concern to me is this. How do we get the greatest amount of housing built, that people can afford, and at the same time benefit the entire economy greatest? Are interest rates the key to this matter? We have seen in other programs such as the RFC, Small Business, Rural Electrification program, and others that by encouraging economic activity at reasonable interest rates, the entire economy has benefited. Even if the interest rate in these programs were subsidized to some small extent, the increase in economic activity, the increase in taxes paid, both individual and corporate, more than outweighed any subsidy cost in the interest rate.

Why wouldn't this be the same in housing? If the interest rate on these various housing programs under consideration here were at a minimum, how much more could be generated in the way of house construction, greater tax returns to all levels of Government, and greater ultimate income to the entire American people?

This is another matter which I hope will be fully explored during these hearings.

3. Do we need to explore the feasibility of new methods of financing such programs as housing and other community facilities? This was a subject when the Joint Economic Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, explored just this month. I would like to read into the record some of the findings and suggestions contained in the 1965 joint economic report. These statements speak both to the importance of interest rates and their role in assuring high levels of economic activity, and the intriguing subject of new methods of financing.

"MONETARY POLICY

"The task of economic recovery and achieving sustained economic growth is not yet completed. It is doubly imperative that the monetary authorities avoid the mistakes of the past and not be tempted or persuaded into a premature application of the monetary brakes.

"Fearfully aware of how easily the stimulative effects of tax reduction might be undone by unwise monetary policy, the committee last year again urged that the monetary authorities follow a policy of monetary expansion in line with the needs of an expanding economy.

"The economic improvement during 1964 has demonstrated the wisdom of that policy. The monetary authorities, apparently also mindful of the error of having prematurely tightened money in past periods of recovery, during the early part of the year maintained sufficient availability of credit to permit a fuller utilization of economic resources.

"We believe that the sustained economic recovery thus far experienced, albeit still less than sufficient to reduce unemployment to acceptable levels, would not have been possible had the past mistaken bias toward an early restriction (in effect, an early contraction when measured against the needs of a growing economy) been repeated. Unfortunately, there has been increasing evidence, beginning in the fall months of 1964 and becoming more marked thus far in 1965, that the monetary authorities are turning toward tighter money. As the recovery progresses, the lessons of the past seem to become unlearned. Economic recovery is not promoted by assertions that market forces have been tightening themselves when in fact the monetary authorities lower the target level of "free reserves," raise the discount rate, and allow the short-term interest rate to inch upward.

"Before this dampening process goes further we must remind the monetary and debt management authorities again that the current task of recovery is not yet done. A stronger economic pulse is insufficient reason for monetary authorities to rush for the sedatives or apply a tourniquet.

"The maintenance of adequate credit has been somewhat constrained because the majority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System apparently feels that higher interest rates are necessary to prevent outflows of short-term capital. There is some question as to whether short-term rates are an important factor in capital movements abroad. Furthermore, the problem of short-term interest rate differences as between this country and Europe arises from the policy of European countries to use restrictive monetary policies and high interest rates to solve their own domestic problems rather than to use restrictive fiscal policies.

"The monetary authorities of this country have responded to this situation in a manner characteristic of central bank thinking. They have encouraged a rise in domestic short-term interest rates in a presumed effort to hold and attract short-term funds in spite of higher foreign rates.

"We believe that the ready acceptance and prompt rationalization by the Federal Reserve System authorities of the need for increasing short-term rates have not given much sufficient weight to the alternatives. Desired effects upon the balance of payments might have been obtained by other means, such as measures affecting the rates of saving in the United States, measures improving the climate for the investment of savings in a thriving domestic economy, measures involving various voluntary limitations on short-term capital exports, and, if the need be sufficient, measures for the direct regulation of short-term capital outflows.

"The monetary authorities have indeed been aided by one such device, the interest equalization tax, which has tended to penalize the outflow of capital from the United States. The President has recently taken steps to further discourage short-term outflows. We suggest that the Congress, in order to close loopholes and make these restrictions effective, may shortly need to consider applying similar interest equalization tax constraints to short-term bank loans of less than 1 year maturity.

"Rising short-term rates in the United States must sooner or later be recognized as being basically incompatible with domestic expansion. Long-term rates, it is true, have been held relatively constant, although they have in fact risen nearly one-quarter percent since the beginning of 1963. We are now confronted with the possibility, indeed probability, that a further rise in the short-term rates must inevitably exert upward pressures upon the long-term rates.

"The pressures toward higher long-term interest rates are particularly disturbing in the light of recent debt management policy. On February 20, 1961, the Federal Reserve System departed from its "bills preferably" policy. It announced that it was then purchasing in the open market U.S. Government notes and bonds of varying maturities, some of which would exceed 5 years. Authority was granted by the Open Market Committee for transactions in securities of "longer maturity" than those dealt in under the previous policy. The announcement, altogether unclear as to Open Market Committee concepts of "long" or "longer" maturities, was widely interpreted to mean that the system was moving to hold down, if not reduce, rates at the long end of the interest curve for Government, mortgagors, and businesses.

"In the 4 years since that announcement, the Federal Reserve System portfolio has been increased by approximately $10 billion, less than $700 million of which has been in maturities of over 5 years. Approximately two-thirds have been in maturity groups of under 1 year. The maturity distribution of portfolio holdings at the end of January 1965, indeed, shows a slight reduction in the proportion of holdings held in the "over-1-year category." The resolution of the Reserve authorities to hold down long-term rates has, to say the least, been disappointing.

Nor is it clear that the debt management authorities have applied their energies very vigorously to holding down long-term interest rates. The Secretary of the Treasury in his testimony to the commitee submitted a table, and took pride in observing that, "an amount larger that the entire $25.1 billion increase in the marketable debt since January 1961 has been financed over that period in longer term issues; marketable debt due in 5 years or more is up $26.9 billion." Why

did the Treasury Department, during an economic recovery period, seek to extend the average maturity of the Government debt by competing for and absorbing long-term funds? However adequate or inadequate its reasons may be, the fact is that neither the monetary nor the debt management authorities have been vigorous in bringing downward pressure on long-term rates while actively and calculatedly raising short-term rates on balance-of-payments grounds.

"The committee recommends that the Federal Reserve authorities and the Treasury cooperate to avoid further increases in domestic interest rates and that:

"Secular increases in the money supply should be provided at the same rate as the growth of real gross national product and should be provided through open market purchases of longer term Federal securities, rather than by either increased holdings of short-term Treasury issues or through the lowering of reserve requirements.

"Debt management should be so handled by the Treasury as to reinforce expansionary fiscal and monetary policies—in particular, they should avoid new issues in longer maturities and advanced refunding at times and in amounts that will frustrate the above recommendation for monetary policy, thus putting upward pressure on long-term interest rates and unnecesarily raising the amount of interest the Government must pay.

"Those responsible for the complementary functions of monetary policy and debt management should recognize that the usual good sense of low-interest rates as encouragements to the economy are this year buttressed by the requirements for financing at minimum cost major governmental programs in education, housing, rehabilitation, and development.

"We urge that the Congress and the monetary authorities give serious, openminded consideration to a search for the best ways of financing the requirements of the President's program for education, overcoming poverty, and for general community and rural rehabilitation. Attainment of these objectives will require increased investment in schools and other facilities by Federal, State, and local governments, the magnitude of which over the next few years may well be as high as $25 billion or more.

"Under current financing practices, the communities of the Nation will have to borrow most of this amount. Even though States and municipalities do have a slight advantage in issuing bonds arising from the tax exemption of income on their obligations, interest costs on these borrowings each year and over the life of the bonds would, under conventional practices, be large and burdensome. Moreover, the communities most in need will have to pay higher rates although less able to do so.

"The special needs of our society for education and rehabilitation are so great that they challenge us to find new methods of financing, such as the feasibility of financing through special-purpose, low-interest-rate bonds, issued directly to the Federal Reserve System. The funds thus made available to the Federal Government would be available for direct investment in needed community developments or for relending to communities themselves at a low rate of interest.

"In considering methods of financing we need to be especially mindful of two things: (1) The Federal Reserve authorities and commercial banks are the trustees of the sovereign power to create credit; and (2) the economic report indicates a persistent gap between existing gross national product and potential. Because the national needs of the program are so great, it is imperative that new methods of financing be explored so that the burden of interest on the sovereign be held to a minimum rather than multiplying the already large cost by payments to middlemen. So long as the gap arising from unused capacity exists, we need to be concerned about reducing its size, rather than fearful of inflationary pressures.

"The committee's report, a year ago, concluded that the Nation had a right to expect better performance by the monetary authorities than it had been getting, adding that 'we must learn from experience and avoid repeating past mistakes.' Except for the rise in the short-term rate, the performance during 1964 in maintaining availability of credit, gives hope that economic lessons have been learned from experience with applying the monetary brakes while the economy is still on the uphill grade as in mid-1957 and early 1960. We warn, however, that the creditable record of the past year is again vulnerable to premature restriction. Because the record has been good thus far, it is doubly important that, in the absence of a clear and present danger of inflation, an unmistakable need to raise interest rates to protect the dollar internationally, or clear evidence of a general deterioration of quality in currently extended credit, restrictive measures should be avoided."

Do we need to develop new methods of financing economic activity such as housing? If we did, would there be a net benefit achieved? Would we get more and better housing at costs which the American people can afford? This suggestion is one of the most stimulating yet developed. If we could once make a breakthrough in this area—by direct financing using the public's credit—I believe we would never again have to face the problem of poverty, recession or depression in this country.

I hope the committee, the witnesses, and staff will explore this idea along with the others suggested above, and the many more which other members will bring up during these most important hearings.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day, we congratulate the Greek people on their achievement and courage, and it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Greece.

When we read of the Greek war of independence early in the 19th century, we were overjoyed to learn how they overthrew the oppressive yoke of alien rule and regained their richly deserved independence.

During their trials and tribulations, their triumphs as well as their national misfortunes, they counted upon our sympathy and support, and today, on the 144th anniversary of their independence, I am happy to be able to say that we have not disappointed them. We have found ways to be of help to them whenever the country, which did more than any other to create Western civilization, needed our help.

One hundred and forty-four years ago Archbishop Germanos, of Patras, raised the standard of revolt in his monastery as Kalavryta against the Turks on March 25, 1821, and his people joined him in a national struggle against their oppressors. His daring deed ushered in a new day for the Greek people. That courageous act by a stout-hearted dignitary of the Greek Church marked a sharp break with the preceding centuries. That day became the Independence Day of the Greeks, and so it remains to this day.

The war which these gallant people waged for almost a decade against the ruthless forces of a powerful enemy at times appeared to be against too high odds, and many friends of the Greek people were rightly apprehensive of its outcome. There were times when the Greek cause seemed all but lost, beyond redemption, and the Greeks seemed almost down and out. But here again the Greeks once more proved their true worth by holding out until their friends abroad could prevail upon their governments to go to the aid of beleaguered and enslaved Greeks. When these governments heard, in 1827, that the Turks were taking captive Greeks out of the country and were offering these poor souls as slaves for sale, they could no longer refrain from open intervention in the Greek War. Fortunately for the Greeks, for all lovers of freedom and for the cause of humanity, this removed any question as to the outcome of the struggle. Greek freedom and independence was assured by the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino Bay in October of 1827.

Since achieving their independence the Greek people have had anxious moments, faced hardships and at times their very independence has been in danger. At such times we have played our part honorably and well in helping the Greeks in their effort to maintain their independence. At the end of the last war we saved Greece from falling into the Communist sphere of influence, and today Greeks are among our staunchest allies in our struggle against Communist totalitarianism. Mr. Speaker, on this 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day, I greet the people of Greece as our loyal allies and cordial friends.

LATIN AMERICAN HOME LOAN BANK

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill, H.R. 6798 to provide for establishment of a Latin American Home Loan Bank. Encouragement of the creation of such an institution that could aid the development of thrift institutions in Latin America has been one of my long-standing interests. On August 19, 1963, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I introduced identical bills on this

subject—H.R. 8143, introduced by Representative PATMAN, and H.R. 8144, introduced by me. On August 22 and 23 and September 12, 1963, hearings were held on these and similar bills before the Committee on Banking and Currency. Testimony was received from savings and loan officials who had made extensive studies on the spot in Latin America concerning the means of encouraging the creation and development of local thrift and home financing systems. Reports made by several such officials were included in the record of those hearings. Testimony was also received from Federal officials, trade association officials, businessmen in charge of housing project operations in Latin American nations, and from some of our distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Further opportunity to consider and discuss this proposal was fortunately presented to me as a speaker and delegate to the Second Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference held in Santiago, Chile, in January 1964. Participating in that conference were Latin Americans from several nations and U.S. citizens interested in developing thrift and home finance institutions throughout the great subcontinent to the south of this country.

In the light of the extremely helpful discussion and suggestions emanating from the committee hearing and the Santiago conference, I have made certain changes in the legislative proposal set forth in H.R. 8144 in the 88th Congress.

First, I have limited its scope to the direct and indirect development of thrift and home finance institutions in Latin America, instead of conferring upon the Bank worldwide responsibilities. The most successful efforts along this line of endeavor in underdeveloped countries to date have occurred in that area of the world. As of the end of calendar year 1964, a total of 83 savings and loan associations with almost 222,000 savers had accumulated net savings of $68.1 million. With that capital serving as a nucleus, over 27,000 new homes had been financed with total outstanding mortgages of $126.5 million. It is most interesting to note that the home finance dollar is more productive in terms of producing adequate shelter in Latin America than it is here at home, for the estimated average sales price of these new homes amounted to only $5,800. Most encouraging is the fact that these statistics represent increases within a single year of 66 percent in savers, 68 percent in amounts saved, 76 percent in number of new homes financed, and an astonishing 122 percent in mortgages recorded. These savings institutions are presently located in only six of the Latin American nations. It is to feed the momentum of this movement and to extend it to other areas in Latin America that an organization like the proposed Latin American Home Loan Bank is greatly needed.

One result of this growth in thrift in Latin America that I feel we do not fully appreciate is that the savings above mentioned are all local capital raised in the countries that form the seat of the thrift institutions we have been discussing. It is not difficult to realize that each of these U.S. dollar equivalents that proceeded to form a pool of local capital in Latin America represented one less U.S. dollar that was required to be exported from the United States to achieve this splendid total of home finance. Here, then, is a striking example of the reason that several of my colleagues and I have been seeking the enactment of legislation to establish a coordinating organization in the United States that will foster such local growth of Latin American capital by providing seed capital for creating new thrift institutions in our good neighbor countries to the south and by offering a source of finance to assist the further growth of existing thrift institutions in Latin America.

When the legislation we desire has demonstrated the admirable results I predict it will achieve in Latin America, it will be timely to consider extending its scope to other quarters of the globe.

A second change I have made in my earlier version of the proposed legislation is found in the composition and manner of selection of the Bank's Board of Directors. Briefly, under the new bill, 3 of the 15-member board would be public interest members selected by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, 3 would give representation to 2 Latin Americans and 1 Federal Home Loan Bank President, also selected by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and 9 would be elected by stockholders of the Bank. Initially these nine would be chosen from personnel of stockholders, but for subsequent terms the choice of the stockholders would be unfettered and they could elect nine directors from any walk of life. I do not claim that this is the only workable solution of creating a viable board of directors for this fine Bank, but I do feel that this arrangement affords fitting representation to the element of control to which the Federal Home Loan Bank Board may claim entitlement by virtue of its status as watchdog of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation insurance reserves. The arrangement also gives appropriate recognition to the likely investment of Federal Home Loan Bank funds in the new Bank. I am especially delighted that this composition of the Board of Directors will include two representatives of the Latin American area who can bring to the deliberations of the Bank intimate and valued knowledge of the manner in which proposed Bank actions or policies would be accepted in Latin America. They would provide the leavening absent in a board consisting wholly of citizens of the United States. Finally the interests of Bank stockholders would be continuously represented through the presence on the Board of Directors of nine persons elected by the stockholders themselves.

The new bill provides that the Board of Directors would be initially chosen in its respective parts for staggered terms of 1, 2, and 3 years, and thereafter for terms of 3 years, so that the terms of one-third of the body would expire annually. The fact that two-thirds of the Board of Directors would remain intact in any given year would serve to provide desirable continuity to the governing body of the Bank. While the bill poses no bar to successive reelection, the selectors or electors have a fairly frequent opportunity to require the members of the Board to give an accounting of their stewardship. In a venture as novel as that proposed in this bill, I deem this to be a desirable arrangement.

A third change from the former version of the bill finds the Federal Home Loan Bank Board retaining its overall regulatory control, but adds a provision borrowed from Export-Import Bank of Washington experience whereunder the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, a Cabinet-level group established under the Bretton Woods Agreement, would be granted the authority from time to time to establish general lending and other financial policies to govern the Bank's Board of Directors. It is my present opinion that this accommodation will adequately enable the Cabinet officers most concerned with foreign policy and operations of the United States to lay down broad guidelines within which the Bank may proceed under the more specific regulation to be provided by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and its own Board of Directors. It appears to me that this procedure is preferable to including on the Board of Directors itself two nominees of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively, to serve as advisers and is also preferable to the precatory statement that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board shall be guided by the Department of State toward the end that Bank actions may be consistent with U.S. foreign policy.

A fourth change from my former version of the bill would enlarge the potential class of eligible stockholders of the Bank to include any person, including any corporation, partnership, or trust. My aim in this respect is to attract as large a potential pool of equity capital for the Bank as is practicable, rather than leaving the general public in the position of participating directly only as holders of debt obligations that may be issued by the Bank. The bill retains the former bill's safeguards as to asset and reserve limitations for stockholders that have savings accounts or deposits insured by FSLIC or FDIC. As another innovation, voting rights are limited to one vote for each thousand dollar par value of stock with an outside limit of 50 votes that may be cast by any one stockholder. With these safeguards against takeover of the Bank by investors uninitiated in the fields of thrift and home finance, it should also be borne in mind that the proposed tripartite nature of the board of directors has added another bulwark against a raid by outside investors to control the governing body of the Bank. As corollaries in the securities field, the new bill requires that par value of the Bank's stock equal its issue price and that the Bank must receive cash payment for stock at the time it is issued. Taken together this set of changes should serve to make it easier to raise working capital for the Bank more quickly than would have been the case under the former version of the bill.

A fifth set of changes from the earlier version deals with functions authorized to be performed by the Bank. Under the new bill, the Bank is given discretion to assist thrift and home finance institutions abroad that are organized as stock associations as well as institutions of that nature that are mutual in form. The authority is permissive and flexible. The Bank will make the decision regarding the type of organization of the institution or institutions it is attempting to aid in any given instance.

Regardless of sentiment in the United States that may favor either the mutual or the stock form of incorporation, it must be kept in mind that the institutions this bill is designed to develop will not be formed under U.S. laws or located in the United States. I deem it essential to remember that successful as any given mode of organization may have been in this country, the basic principles of operation when transplanted to foreign shores must be accompanied by a willingness to adapt the style of organization that will execute those principles to the mores and customs of the jurisdiction that will serve as the locale of the institution to be developed. Therefore it seems highly advisable to arm the Bank with flexible powers so that it may meet acceptable requirements for adaptation.

Also in the category of functions the new bill would broaden the powers of the Bank on a permissible but not mandatory basis by authorizing it to assist in developing facilities abroad for insuring savings and insuring mortgages, and for providing secondary market facilities in Latin America. Again, the Bank could resort to use of any or all of these powers where their use appears desirable or hold them in reserve where their use does not seem appropriate in any given set of circumstances. The new bill would also grant the Bank authority to conduct the training of personnel to operate the institutions the Bank is assisting to develop. Once again, this is a permissive, not a mandatory, function of the Bank, to be utilized on occasions when the Bank deems it appropriate to accomplish its overall mission.

As a sixth change, Bank borrowings under the new bill would be limited to 10 times the par value of its outstanding stock. This should put a desirable control on the overall issue of Bank debt obligations, and thus improve their likely quality as lawful investments for public funds. The changes formerly explained that should make the raising of equity capital easier should also make it less necessary for the Bank to raise as much borrowed capital as would otherwise be the case.

The new bill would exempt from Federal income tax income from both debt and equity securities issued by the Bank. The results accomplished from the operation of this Bank should save a related amount of foreign aid grants by the U.S. Government. Under the circumstances the proposed tax exemption would assist in attracting capital at a net saving to the Federal Government over what outright grants of foreign aid would cost.

A seventh change in the bill is found in the provisions in section 9 making specific loan and equity investment guarantees under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, available to the Bank from the Agency for International Development. An additional $50 million would be authorized for that purpose in addition to the $350 million proposed to be provided for housing project and thrift institution guarantees under the Foreign Aid Act of 1965 presently pending before the Congress.

If the Members of the House could have been with me at the Santiago Conference in 1964 to see the great expectations our friends in Latin America place in the program proposed in this legislation, I am sure they would share my enthusiasm for this proposal. I want to emphasize two points.

First. Not 1 penny of taxpayers' money is directly involved in this program. The only indirect relation between such moneys and the bill is the insurance of savings by FDIC and FSLIC in the case of thrift institutions that invest up to 1 percent of their assets in Bank stock, and the potential guaranty of Bank loan and equity investment that might be made available by AID upon application from the Bank. However, the working capital of the Bank would derive from proceeds of sale of its stock, loans, if any, floated by the Bank, and its earnings. In this respect the Bank would constitute a close parallel to a Federal savings and loan association and a Federal Home Loan Bank.

Second. The proposed program will not work at cross purposes with our country's efforts to achieve a favorable balance of payments. I understand that our balance-of-payments remedial policies are not intended to be applied in underdeveloped areas. The legislative program proposed in this bill is intended to operate only in underdeveloped areas in Latin America. Because of the severe shortage of housing that exists in that part of the world, underdeveloped areas coincide with the geographic area known as Latin America in the field of home finance. Moreover, the very purpose of the program envisaged by this bill is to develop pools of local thrift capital in Latin America. Consequently any immediate investment of U.S. dollars is of a pump-priming nature. It is expected that these relatively few dollars will serve to develop an indigenous system of thrift and home finance institutions in Latin America that should serve to decrease the request for dollars to be exported from the United States for home finance in Latin America.

Our friends to the South place high hopes in this proposed program. I hope that this Congress will provide solid substance for those high hopes by enacting legislation along the lines of the bill I have introduced. A third Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference is scheduled to be held in Quito, Ecuador, later this month. Early congressional attention to this bill would serve to sustain the faith the people of Latin America have placed in the frequent assertions made by officials of the U.S. Government that we to the North want to help our good neighbors to the South to help themselves.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE LATIN AMERICAN HOME LOAN BANK ACT

Section 1. Short title: "Latin American Home Loan Bank Act."

Section 2. Definitions:

(a) Bank: Latin American Home Loan Bank.

(b) Board: Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

(c) Member: Member of Bank, except where context refers to member of Federal Home Loan Bank.

(d) Stock: Bank stock.

Section 3. Bank incorporation: Board shall provide for incorporation and operation of Bank. Board has general regulatory power. National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems shall establish general lending and financial policies of Bank.

Section 4. (a) Board of Directors: 15 persons—3 public interest members chosen by Board (may include savings and loan personnel)—2 Latin Americans and 1 Federal Home Loan Bank President chosen by Board. Nine from personnel of subscribing members elected by latter initially, thereafter members elect any 9 persons. Terms, initially 1, 2, and 3 years, thereafter 3 years. Compensation, same as Board members, except Federal officeholders for profit and Federal Home Loan Bank officers receive none. Chairman and Vice Chairman elected by Board of Directors for annual terms. Directors may succeed selves and hold until successor qualifies. Vacancies filled for unexpired term. Non-U.S. citizen's oath not to conflict with his duties as citizen of his homeland. Bank management vests in Board of Directors. Board and Bank may delegate functions. Bank may delegate functions of Board of Directors, Chairman, and Vice Chairman.

(b) Board of Directors as incorporators file organization certificate with Board. Bank's principal office anywhere in United States; may establish branch offices anywhere it operates. Bank has general corporate powers, including power to sue and defend wherever it operates. Certificate of organization may be amended by Board of Directors with Board approval.

(c) Board of Directors may hire and dismiss Bank personnel.

(d) Bank may be public depositary and Federal fiscal agent.

Section 5. Capital stock: Board controls issuance of stock, including issue price.

Section 6. Eligible members: Federal Home Loan Bank, members of Federal Home Loan Bank (includes Federal savings and loan associations), State-chartered savings and loan associations authorized to be Federal Home Loan Bank members, mutual savings banks, and any person, including corporation, partnership or trust. All stockholders are Bank members. Vote: 1 per $1,000 par value of stock owned, maximum 50 votes per member. No stock issued until fully paid.

(b) Grants stockholding authority for Federal Home Loan Banks, Federal savings and loan associations, State-chartered savings and loan associations authorized to be Federal Home Loan Bank members, mutual savings banks and any Federal Home Loan Bank member, but all the foregoing are limited to investing not over 1 percent of assets in bank stock (except mutual savings banks not insured by FDIC), and except that limit for a Federal Home Loan Bank is 1 percent of capital stock, reserves, and surplus. No Federal savings and loan association. Federal Home Loan Bank member (except an insurance company), or mutual savings having FDIC insurance may buy Bank stock unless its reserves and surplus equal at least 5 percent of savings accounts.

Section 7. (a) Operations—Defines:

Foreign thrift and home financing institution: organization outside United States that receives savings and finances homes, and has Latin American office.

Foreign home loan bank: Latin American organization making loans or advances to or investments in thrift and home finance institution in its country.

Foreign insurance facility: Latin American organization that insures savings accounts or mortgages.

Foreign secondary market facility: Latin American institution that maintains secondary market for mortgages.

(b) Bank may lend, advance funds, or invest in shares or obligations of organizations defined in (a) above. Bank has customary and appropriate powers of an international banking organization. Bank may aid formation and development of thrift and home finance and related institutions abroad. Bank may conduct studies and training. Bank funds may otherwise be invested as Board approves.

Section 8. (a) Borrowings: Bank may borrow up to 10 times the par value of outstanding stock, but needs Treasury approval for a public offering.

(b) Bank obligations are lawful investments for fiduciary and public funds (except Federal Reserve Bank funds and except that national bank trust funds must comply with Federal Reserve regulations).

(c) Other laws governing securities and exchanges are made inapplicable.

Section 9. (a) Guaranty of investments: Bank is an eligible U.S. investor under the AID guaranty program.

(b) AID program is amended to permit guaranty, on terms and conditions fixed by the President, of Bank equity investments and its loan investments to the extent not already covered by that program. An additional $50 million guaranty fund is authorized, raising the total to $400 million for the AID housing and thrift institution guaranty program.

Section 10. (a) Miscellaneous: Federal Reserve Banks and Federal Home Loan Banks may act as depositaries and fiscal or other agents for Bank.

(b) Bank may use and pay for services of Federal Government agencies. Expenses of Bank, Board, and FSLIC are nonadministrative.

(c) Bank stock and obligations are exempt from Federal and State taxes (except Federal estate, inheritance, and gift taxes).

(d) Bank itself is exempt from all Federal and State taxes (except State and local taxes on real property).

Section 11. (a) through (e): Federal criminal statutes that apply to financial institutions, officers, employees, and examiners are extended to protect the Bank.

Section 12. Separability: This act generally governs Bank actions. Should part of the act be held invalid, the remainder stays in effect.

Section 13. Right to amend: The right to alter, amend, or repeal the act is reserved.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of the Byelorussian National Republic. [redacted]

Byelorussia was an independent nation long before most of the members of the United Nations achieved nationhood. The Byelorussians, never feeling that they were a make-believe nation, have for centuries maintained a sense of national entity under Russian oppression and domination. They have maintained their religion and their language.

Like their neighbors, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, and Ukraine, they are denied their right of self-determination.

After centuries of foreign rule, and unsuccessful attempts to revolt in 1812, 1830, and 1863, Byelorussia proclaimed its independence in 1917. Within 4 years, however, Russian domination was reimposed.

In spite of discouragements, a spirit of independence persists, the fictitious statehood devised by the Soviets is resisted, and this third largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union keeps alive a national feeling.

Americans of Byelorussian descent continue to call attention to the fight for self-determination. By our observance today, we help them in this fight.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today being the 47th anniversary of the birth of the Byelorussian democratic independence, I feel all Americans might benefit from giving thought to the unhappy history of this brave people which has waged wars for several centuries to preserve the independence which even today is denied them.

The post-World War II experience of the Byelorussian people with the Russian Communists might well become the experience of all nations in today's free world if the Kremlin succeeds in its drive toward world domination and if we of the West relax our vigilance or lose heart in our fight to remain free.

The persecutions the Byelorussians have been subjected to by conquerors over five centuries, particularly the brutal mistreatment they received at the hands of the Nazis and, more recently, the Communists, should give us all pause.

Today, the hopes and dreams of those who created the Byelorussian Democratic Republic on March 25, 1918, are still alive, but their country exists today as the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, created by the Kremlin leaders and completely unrepresentative of the some 18 million Byelorussians.

In fact, the Byelorussian [redacted], the third largest constituent Soviet Republic, has within its present borders less than half the population and about one-half the territory its ethnography and language would fix as its population and area.

In the modern history of Byelorussia, we can take a warning from the cruel manner in which their Soviet masters absorbed and crushed this freedom-loving people. The Kremlin has not, however, crushed the desire for independence of the Byelorussian people, and we must strengthen our resolve to make certain the fate of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic never befalls the United States of America.

A BETTER FATE FOR BYELORUSSIA

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we pause once again to note the anniversary of the establishment of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic some 47 years ago. It helps us bring our own values into focus to honor those who in the past have struggled for the freedom of this ancient land and those who today, in the face of all adversity, keep faith with this historic goal.

This is not an anniversary of joyous celebration, Mr. Speaker, for the Byelorussians have experienced independence only once in modern times, in the year 1918. Rather, it is an occasion of sadness and sober rededication to the principle of self-determination and to the inalienable right of this brave little nation to see it put into practice.

Despite the heavy migration of Byelorussians to other countries, and heavy losses of population during the wars, some 6 to 7 million persons there today speak their own national language and maintain their separate national tradition. Byelorussian is a Slavic tongue which evolved from the early Russian language under the influence of centuries of Lithuanian and later Polish rule.

"Byelo" of course means "white," and the Byelorussians reportedly derived their name from their traditional white homespun garments. Never blessed with great prosperity, their greatest misfortune was to be placed by an accident of geography between larger contending states. In 1795, in the third partition of Poland, the expansionist Empress Catherine the Great of Russia completed a process of piecemeal takeover of Byelorussia from Poland which had been going on since the 15th century. Napoleon fought across Byelorussia in his advance on Moscow in 1812, and the most famous battle of the grim retreat from Moscow took place at the Berezina River of Byelorussia.

German forces fought the czarist Russians across Byelorussia in World War I, reaching the capital city of Minsk in 1918. When the new Republic was proclaimed on March 25 of that year, the torch of freedom flamed but briefly, only to be overwhelmed later the same year by the numerically superior forces of the Red army. Again the following year, in

the Russian-Polish conflict, and again in World War II, in the furious combat of Hitler's Wehrmacht and Stalin's Red army, the Byelorussian people and their homeland suffered seemingly endless death and destruction.

Surely those who have suffered so much and who have sought their independence so long deserve a better fate than continued oppression under foreign totalitarian rule. Surely, Mr. Speaker, a better day will come. Then the deception of nominal statehood, controlled from Moscow, will be replaced in a restoration of the true national independence which Byelorussians and those of Byelorussian descent have never ceased to work for and to cherish.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Byelorussian people. It is singularly appropriate, therefore, that we in this great Nation, who have experienced liberty for nearly 188 years, should pause for a moment to reflect on the tragic history of these valiant people. For 300 years the Byelorussians toiled to purchase the jewel of liberty, but only for 3 years were they destined to possess it before their nation was crushed under the brutal heel of Soviet tyranny.

For three centuries the Byelorussians existed as an ethnically distinct people endowed with their own customs and cultural traditions and with a strong consciousness of their separate national destiny. And every hour during those 300 years their intense yearning for national independence never once wavered. In 1918, the chance was seized and an independent Byelorussian National Republic was proclaimed, only to collapse 3 years later before the onslaught of the Red army.

Their profile in history vividly reminds us today that we must strive, as President Kennedy reminded us, "to build a new world of law where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved." Only in such a world will the noble aspirations of these freedom loving people be realized. We salute them, and pray that one day they may regain their long-cherished independence.

FLORIDA FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to increase the monetary authorization for the central and southern Florida flood control project. This project spans all or parts of 18 counties in Florida, and is credited with saving millions of dollars and countless lives since it was authorized by the Congress in 1948.

The CSSFCD has in a large part made the growth of Florida possible. The project has turned land once inundated by flood and hurricane into land useful to new industries and new Florida residents who have come from virtually every part of America.

The benefits of this project have been estimated at over $200 million. This is pretty good return in view of the total expenditures of approximately $175 million in the first 15 years of this project.

But the phenomenal growth of Florida, and particularly the area encompassed by the CSSFCD, make flood control protection a critical necessity. Now, as a result of the changing land use which has accompanied Florida's population expansion, the planning of this project as it was originally conceived has had to change as rapidly and drastically as has the face of the land itself. Flood control theories and practices as they affect Florida have been altered and extended to conform to the growth of our State.

The existing monetary authorization for the project is $127,300,000. With $13,320,000 in the President's budget for fiscal year 1966, and appropriations through June 30, 1965, coming to a total of $124,500,000, the basin authorization for the project is in need of increase. Even with the appropriations of $124,500,000 to date, a theoretical monetary authorization balance of $2,800,000 is left.

There is barely enough authorization left to now carry construction on the project through the first quarter of fiscal year 1966. Unless there is an increase of at least $30 million as proposed in the legislation which I have today introduced, there will have to be cutbacks and curtailment of operations as well as a halt to new construction starts.

This situation would of course seriously hamper the progressive growth and orderly development of our flood control projects so drastically needed to give the protection needed for the expanding area served by the CSSFCD.

I urge the Congress to act promptly on my bill introduced today to give monetary increase to the central and southern Florida flood control project.

REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill identical to one I introduced in the 88th Congress, and it has provisions which are of deep interest to many of the major cities of our Nation, including Providence, the capital city of my own State of Rhode Island.

This legislation, if considered favorably by the Congress, will eliminate the population limitation set by previous legislation under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955. Specifically, the present law contains a provision for assistance to cities situated within economically depressed areas. Most cities within these areas are allowed three-quarters of the cost of urban renewal projects, instead of two-thirds of the cost, which is the usual amount granted. However, present legislation contains an additional stipulation which denies the cities having a total population of 150,000 and above the three-quarter allowance. Although it is evident that the original intent of the legislation was to provide additional benefits and increased incentives to depressed areas, the present law does not accomplish this; for it provides additional assistance to the smaller cities and the towns within depressed areas, but denies this additional benefit to the larger cities within the same depressed areas. This is neither logical nor equitable. Certainly if small cities in our labor depressed areas have economic problems, it stands to reason that the larger cities within these areas have even more need for they have larger and more complicated problems.

Therefore, in line with our present desire to combat poverty throughout the country, I urgently request the support of my colleagues for the repeal of this restriction in order that the larger cities of our economically depressed areas may increase activities in urban renewal planning and development.

TAX ASSISTANCE FOR THE ORTHOPEDICALLY HANDICAPPED EMPLOYED

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the President's poverty campaign will, we are certain, restore hope to the Nation's distressed and disinherited during this period of great national prosperity. One such forgotten group is the Nation's employed orthopedically handicapped; a heavy expense burdened group whose average income ranges from submarginal to marginal.

Legislation to accord income tax assistance to the orthopedically handicapped taxpayer has for some years been pending in Congress. H.R. 424, which I have reintroduced, is a bill to provide an additional tax exemption in the case of an orthopedically handicapped taxpayer suffering from a 50-percent-or-more loss or loss of use of one or more extremities under the "Schedule for Rating Disabilities of the Veterans' Administration"—Federal Register, volume 29, No. 101, part II. In addition, deductions not exceeding $600 for transportation expenses in going to and from work would be allowed. This bill will, if passed, grant a measure of assistance to those physically handicapped persons most in need of it. H.R. 424 can reduce some inequities for the disabled, currently existing in the Internal Revenue Code.

In order to appreciate the wage status of the orthopedically handicapped worker, I refer to figures released by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which indicate that during the year 1963, of 368,696 referrals for vocational rehabilitation, only 110,136 were accepted; before rehabilitation, the average weekly wage was a low $8 per week and, after rehabilitation, average weekly wages rose to $42 per week. Of those rehabilitated, 47 percent had one or more dependents. Each year there was a backlog of 70 percent of referrals still in need of rehabilitation; 34 percent of the rehabilitants needed surgery and treatment. The average country-wide cost of prosthetic devices was $172 per rehabilitant, according to the VRA. However, the average person does not acquire prosthetic devices at such low prices; the going rate in the New York area is $500 for the average cost of a full artificial leg; $450 for artificial leg below the knee, and so forth. Other costs for the rehabilitant are: bilateral brace $350—brace extended to trunk add $50—brace above the knee $250 to $350, brace below the knee $100, wheel chair—standard—$200, custom-made special shoes average $120 to $175 for the first pair and $85 to $100 for the second pair, and so forth.

As can be seen, the orthopedically handicapped, by reason of their disabilities, are compelled to spend substantial sums of money, out of proportion to their level of incomes in order to maintain their rehabilitated status. Their expenditures frequently include:

First. Expenses incurred for the purchase, repair, and replacement of orthopedic and prosthetic devices not entirely deductible under the medical deduction provision of the code—special orthopedically built shoes are in this category.

Second. Unusual wear and tear of clothing caused by constant friction with orthopedic and prosthetic devices, crutches, and by falling.

Third. Additional expenses often include higher apartment rentals due to need of ground floor quarters or elevator apartment accommodations, which are higher rental apartments.

Fourth. Many disabled find it necessary to hire taxicabs daily in going to and from work. In the New York area the average weekly cost for this type of travel is about $25 to $30.

Fifth. In approximately 10 percent of the cases, the disabled, as defined in the bill, find it necessary to purchase automobiles to allow for mobility to and from work, and so forth. These automobiles, of necessity, must be kept in top condition to avoid mechanical failure. Hand controls are a requisite. A businessman can deduct the cost of his vehicle, as well as vehicular expenses for the production of income, while his physically handicapped employee who needs his car for the production of income cannot, despite the fact that he might be in a wheelchair and despite the extenuating circumstances.

Sixth. Paraplegics often find it necessary to purchase their own homes which are specially equipped with fixtures installed at lower levels. Ramps and wider doorways must be built to allow for ingress and egress to and from the premises.

Seventh. The disabled are frequently compelled to hire someone to do the household cleaning and repairing.

Eighth. Due to discrimination in the labor market, physically handicapped persons are frequently forced to accept lower wages and salaries.

Ninth. They are, as substandard risks, compelled to pay higher life insurance rates where they are able to afford the minimums of life insurance coverage. By the same token, they are rejected for health and accident insurance and, as a result, have higher medical and hospital expenses than the average taxpayer.

From the foregoing, it is obvious that the orthopedically handicapped taxpayers are subjected to heavy financial expenses that the average able-bodied taxpayer is not subjected to.

Many physically handicapped persons could have been rehabilitated were it not for their expenses in relation to their low wages and the high cost of maintaining their rehabilitated status. Many are frequently resigned to remaining home since their low gross income, less tax deductions, would give them a lower net income than if they remained home on relief.

According to figures published in the 1964 United States Statistical Abstract, the total number of 1963 job placements through public employment offices amounted to 13,818,000. This figure includes 278,000 physically handicapped persons who were placed in jobs; the latter comprise 2 percent of all workers placed by public employment offices. However, 2 percent apparently is too high a figure when one considers that the handicapped are rarely placed through private employment agencies and since, percentagewise, public employment offices place a higher percentage of handicapped workers.

By taking 2 percent of 68,809,000 total employed civilian labor force for the year 1963, we get a total theoretical physically handicapped working population, including every type of disability, of 1,376,180. However, the U.S. Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation finds that out of 110,136 rehabilitants 36.7 percent of this total include all orthopedic deformities, amputee and trunk cases varying from less severe to severe. If we multiply .367 with 1,376,180, we get 505,057 orthopedically handicapped persons, all told, affected by this legislation. Since the 36.7 percent includes 14.5 percent severe cases and 22.2 percent less severe cases, a further breakdown shows that there are 199,536 severe cases and 305,521 less severe cases. Allowing for a possible 100,000 borderline cases between severe and less severe to possibly qualify under H.R. 424, then we can assume that approximately 300,000 maximum would qualify under this tax legislation.

Even if all 300,000 disabled taxpayers claimed $600 tax exemptions with savings of $120 each, the savings in taxes for disabled taxpayers would be a total of $36 million. If as many as 15 percent of the 300,000 disabled taxpayers took advantage of the transportation deductions, they would save up to $4 million. The grand total for both types of savings would be approximately $40 million.

One must remember that it costs an average of from $479 to $544 to rehabilitate an orthopedically handicapped person. For the rest of his or her life the rehabilitated person will have to purchase, replace, and repair all sorts of prosthetic devices, specially built shoes, specially built braces, crutches, wheel chairs, automobiles and automobile hand controls, to say nothing of corrective surgery.

After rehabilitation, the disabled worker, as previously noted, earned an average of $42 per week. The average weekly benefit in the United States for a totally unemployed worker under the various unemployment insurance programs—State—for the fiscal year 1963–64 was $35.59; income which is not taxable. The disabled worker's average weekly income is only $6.41 more than unemployment income and the latter income is taxable in full.

The granting of tax assistance under H.R. 424 during the current session of Congress would lighten, to a degree, the financial burdens weighing heavily on the shoulders of the employed handicapped taxpayer.

In the past, the U.S. Tax Court denied handicapped taxpayers deductions for transportation expenses to and from work holding that these are merely commuter expenses—*John C. Bruton* v. *CIR*, 9 TC–88a; *Comm.* v. *Flowers*, 326 U.S. 465; *James Donnelly* v. *Comm.*, 28 TC, No. 159. The orthopedically disabled individual uses his or her car as a necessity and not as a luxury. H.R. 424 would aid the handicapped taxpayer by allowing deductions up to $600 where they are presently disallowed.

I trust that H.R. 424 will be enacted at this session of Congress. Such legislation is long overdue.

A partial list of organizations and individuals endorsing H.R. 424 follows:

Adlai Stevenson, Averell Harriman, Robert F. Wagner, the late Herbert H. Lehman, the late Eleanor Roosevelt.

Governors: Annual Conference of Governors, summer 1963—Joe Foss, South Dakota; William W. Barron, West Virginia; G. Mennen Williams, Michigan; Price Daniels, Texas;

William L. Guy, North Dakota; Orval E. Faubus, Arkansas; Leroy Collins, Florida; Bert Combs, Kentucky.

Senators: JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama; JACOB JAVITS, New York; BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa.

Brooks Hays, Arkansas (former president, Southern Baptist Convention).

Newspapers: New York Times, New York Daily News, Sioux City Journal, Christian Herald, Electrical Union World, Progressive Farmer.

ORGANIZATIONS

Religious: National Council of Churches of Christ, U.S.A. (40 million); Methodist Church, U.S.A. (10 million); International Convention Disciples of Christ; American Council of Christian Churches; United Church Women; United Lutheran Synod, New York and New England; Riverside Church; Catholic War Veterans, U.S.A.; Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A.

Labor: American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organization (13,500,000); International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO; Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO; International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO; United Automobile Workers of America; Labor's Non Partisan League.

Farm: National Farmers Union, U.S.A.; Progressive Farmer.

Veteran: Catholic War Veterans of U.S.A.; Jewish War Veterans of U.S.A.; American War Dads; American Legion, New York and Missouri Departments; Veterans of Foreign Wars, U.S.A.; Disabled American Veterans (Nos. 87 and 45); Army and Navy Union (N.Y. County Council); Masonic War Veterans (State of New York); Amputee Veterans of America; Italian-American War Veterans, U.S.A.

Medical: American Academy of Compensation Medicine; American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons; American Congress of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation; American Physical Therapy Association; Maine Medical Society.

Law: New York Workmen's Compensation Association.

Old Age Pension Groups: National Institute for Social Welfare (200,000); Old Age and Public Assistance Union of Illinois; Rocky Mountain Institute for Social Welfare.

Women: General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Social Work: National Association of Social Workers; Jewish Community Services of Long Island.

Fraternal: Grand Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, New York State; Grand Lodge, Free and Accepted Masons, New York State.

Handicapped: National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis; National Amputation Foundation; Congress of Organizations of the Physically Handicapped, Inc.; Joint Handicapped Council; Paralyzed Veterans of America; National Association of the Physically Handicapped, Inc.; Dr. Howard Rust-Rehabilitation and world renowned medical expert on the handicapped; medical editor of the New York Times.

In sympathy with H.R. 424: Daughters of the American Revolution.

Support H.R. 424 in principle: Taxation Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, U.S.A.; National Grange (farm).

How long, Mr. Speaker, must those who do so much to help themselves be denied so little as is sought for them by H.R. 424?

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE: A TRIBUTE

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, once again we commemorate the anniversary of Byelorussian independence.

On this solemn occasion we pay tribute to a people who have a yearning to assert their own national identity. For what they feel is a sense of pride in their nation, in their history, in their culture, and in their role as a people in the world today.

But the Byelorussians have no genuine way to assert their own sense of national identity. There is no freedom of cultural expression in the Soviet Union. There is no political freedom. There is no way, no instrumentality, in which they can establish their own national separateness.

This is not possible because Byelorussians are a people subjugated within a vast totalitarian, multinational state. On the one hand the Soviets claim that the various non-Russian peoples have the constitutional right of freedom. The various constituent republics are supposed to have the right to secede. This is, of course, a fiction. And it is a fiction also when the Soviets claim that the nationalities have the right to establish and permit to flourish their own particular cultural heritage.

The destiny of the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union is already established, and their destiny, if Soviet policy is successful, means complete destruction of any idea of national separateness and assimilation into the larger national ideal. This ideal constitutes a mixture of Communist and Great Russian values. In other words, Byelorussians, Ukrainians, Armenians, and the other non-Russian peoples will lose all sense of national identification with their culture and historical past. For those who wish documentation for this projected destiny, I suggest that you review those parts of the third program of the Soviet Communist Party that deals with the nationality problem.

On this day of commemoration of Byelorussian independence it is well for us to face the unpleasant realities that beset all the non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. Their tasks ahead will be difficult and challenging. All odds are against them except one, and that is the lessons of history. We can find hope and solace in history; for the Russians have in the past instituted powerful programs of Russification, and they failed. And I do not doubt that with this enormous human task facing them today, they will fail again.

To all Byelorussians who love their native land, I extend my warmest congratulations, and I join with all freemen in the hope that your destiny will not be one of enslavement but rather one in which you will have the right to determine your own national future.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXIV

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the 24th part of the series on New York City in Crisis appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This installment contrasts the efforts of other cities in coping with the problems of modern urban society with those of New York City. It appeared on February 14, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—HOW OTHER CITIES BATTLE DECAY, IDLENESS, RACE STRIFE

(By Barrett McGurn, of the Herald Tribune Staff)

DETROIT

"The whole thing is not to go to the well too often."

Jerome P. Cavanagh, 37, mayor of America's fifth-largest city, rolled back in his overstuffed swivel chair and explained how Detroit has organized not one but three citizens' groups to deal with the decay of the heart of the city, with unemployment, and with racial friction.

Civic leaders have suggested that New York might take similar action to improve the deteriorating conditions of life and work in the greatest city of the world.

There were many difficulties in setting up the Detroit committees, Mayor Cavanagh said. Some automobile manufacturers tried to beg off on the ground that "we're not tied to one city—we work on a world basis." There were also political problems because of scattered small governments around the Detroit central area.

That situation would be even worse in New York, where there are 16 million people and 1,600 separate county, borough, township, and village governments inside the three-State metropolitan area. But Detroit's own problems in that regard are not inconsiderable.

"In our metropolitan area," the sharp-eyed, quick-smiling Mayor Cavanagh pointed out, "we have 4 million people and 500 local governments."

Bankrupt

When Mayor Cavanagh, a Democrat running as a nonpartisan, took over in Detroit 4 years ago, the municipality was bankrupt. Before anyone had time to cry "ouch," the new chief executive put in a 1-percent income tax for everyone who worked in the city, whether he lived there or not. Even Canadians from nearby Windsor were required to pay.

Lately the out-of-city residents have been cut back to a tax of one-half of 1 percent, but $45 million a year is still flowing into Detroit's coffers from all income tax sources, and the city is, as Mayor Cavanagh says now, far from bankrupt.

The three civic groups were patched together by asking busy, prosperous men to give time and funds for specific, quick-moving, cooperative projects. Fund requests were limited and no time was squandered.

One city group works against racial discrimination. Detroit's population is 30 percent Negro.

Another, the Detroit Metropolitan Industrial Development Corp. (known as "Demidco"), finances hotels, motels, and other new jobmaking ventures, serving as a channel for large Federal funds.

A third, the Metropolitan Fund, helped by the Ford Foundation, serves as the liaison between Detroit and its surrounding "bedroom communities," conducting regional-plan studies and convincing outlying groups to cooperate on water, sewage, pollution control, and other projects.

The change

The handsome outer suburbs had looked upon Detroit's swarming, heterogeneous population with about as much concern as the rural districts of Connecticut's Fairfield County or the rich commuter communities of New Jersey nurture for Harlem, but the Metropolitan Fund has made strides in changing that.

A typical civic group was the one dealing with racial friction. The Episcopal Bishop of Michigan, the Rt. Rev. Richard S. Emrich, stated that he convinced Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers Union, that he should take part, and Mr. Reuther used a chance meeting at a party to get Henry Ford II, chairman of the board of Ford Motor Co., to join up, too.

Each of the three groups has from 50 to 100 members. Presidents and vice presidents of Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler—typical "world interest" concerns—and the chief administrative officers of Wayne, Detroit, and Michigan Universities sit side by side with Mayor Cavanagh, labor leaders, and church officials inside the directing boards of the three.

Some of the three groups meet as often as once a month—a real sacrifice of time for busy men, but one that has borne fruit. In a city that saw 34 dead and 700 injured in a 1943 race riot, for instance, Mayor Cavanagh can boast now that "we have the country's best racial peace record for a city of our size."

What Detroit has done, so have many other cities. Here are a few:

NEW HAVEN

A decade ago there was a don't-rock-the-boat city administration. Then a whirlwind who had been Yale University's press agent, Richard C. Lee, became mayor.

The Ford Foundation gave $2,500,000 to help organize Community Progress, Inc., a group of businessmen, city officials and other community leaders. A fund of $138 million ($88 million of it private capital) was raised for new construction in rundown areas.

Racially integrated housing and a better commercial area are the results, and it is the city's pride that the R. H. Macy Co. has shown its confidence by moving in.

ST. LOUIS

The grim quip about St. Louis in the early 1950's was that the once glorious "gateway to the West" was peopled by civic leaders who thought that "the best place for money is in the bank."

All that is changed. Sidney Maestre, then chairman of the board of the Mercantile Trust Co., formed Downtown in St. Louis, Inc., which is raising $89 million in private funds to end the decay of the city's heart. Other businessmen created Civic Progress, Inc. Mr. Maestre and David R. Calhoun, Jr., then president of the St. Louis Union Trust Co., cooperated with the reform city administration of a former college professor, Raymond Tucker, a Democrat, to put across a $110,000,000 public improvement bond issue, the largest in St. Louis history.

With the help of a 300-member committee the two bankers combed through $240 million in fund requests, then lured an additional $2.7 billion in Federal, State and private aid. Expressways, slum clearance, new parks, new health centers and a revived downtown area were the result.

SEATTLE

A newspaperman (Ross Cunningham, associate editor of the Seattle Times) and a chamber of commerce director (the late Dan Follett) agreed in 1954 that Seattle needed an economic shot in the arm—a fair. They got the fair and more besides.

The Central Association, a group of downtown businessmen, was organized. Fair, city, Federal, and private projects were combined. In all, $200 million was spent to put in throughways, fix up the city's core, combat water pollution, and meet housing needs.

PITTSBURGH

The city boasts of a renaissance, and one look at the soaring downtown Golden Triangle skyscraper section tells why. Frank Lloyd Wright once said that the only thing in Pittsburgh worth saving was its somber granite jail, but no one would say that now. Newspapers, businessmen, the steel mills, and the city administration pooled forces to fight air pollution, river flooding, unemployment, and downtown decay.

PHILADELPHIA

Comics used to call it "Forest Lawn with light." In the 17th century it was America's first planned city, thanks to William Penn, but by the early 1950's a "Chinese wall" carrying the Pennsylvania Railroad split the city, factory areas were blighted, traffic was a mess.

Then reform began. Businessmen and bankers formed the Greater Philadelphia movement, joining forces with the six-decade-old committee of 70 (a group of churchmen, labor leaders, factory operators, educators). A reform administration moved into city hall.

Now the railroad's wall is down. City, State, Federal, and private funds have run up fine new office buildings and hotels. A 30-acre riverfront slum has become a $100 million food distribution center. And the historic Philadelphia of the 18th century has not been sacrificed.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXV

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues part XXV of the series on "New York City in Crisis" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This installment concerns the dilemma of New York City's small hospitals and appeared on February 14, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CITY'S SMALL HOSPITALS: A CRISIS IN INEFFICIENCY

(By Earl Ubell, Science Editor)

You can call them hospitals of good intentions. They make no profit on their patients. They take care of the poor, often at a loss. Men of good will and good bank accounts give them time and money. Religious orders operate some of them.

But despite the best intentions, you can die needlessly in them because they have not kept up with medicine.

These hospitals are in deep trouble. And it is getting worse. They hover between the pit of bankruptcy and the pendulum of time. Time is running out for these well-intentioned institutions. The march of inflation squeezes them on one side; the advance of medical science from the other.

SIZE

These well-intentioned hospitals are 33 charity institutions, voluntary hospitals, which have fewer than 200 beds. In hospital jargon, they are called "small voluntaries" to distinguish them from the profitmaking proprietaries and from the 500-bed to 1,500-bed giant medical centers such as Presbyterian, Mount Sinai and St. Vincent's hospitals, also voluntary.

Daily, reports of impending catastrophe pile up:

From the city department of health: the reliability record of the small voluntary hospitals' laboratories is the worst of any group of institutions in the city, except profit-making proprietary hospitals.

From the American Medical Association: These hospitals do not have approved medical teaching programs. Experts say such teaching is essential to high quality medical care.

From the State department of social welfare: Small hospitals have a higher proportion of staff and technician vacancies than any other group of hospitals.

From the Hospital Review and Planning Council: Small voluntaries are growing relatively more inefficient. We will not approve construction or modernization of any hospital of this size.

REACH

All this, with the best intentions in the world. All this, while men of good will continue to pour millions into the hospitals. All this, while Blue Cross struggles to keep its insurance premiums from soaring beyond the reach of the middle class.

"New York City is at the crossroads in hospital development," says Dr. Jack C. Haldeman, president of the hospital council. "In the next decade we're going to see these small hospitals consolidated into large units. The trend has already begun."

Msgr. Patrick J. Frawley, director of health and hospitals of Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York says: "We know that the small hospital is the weakest institution in our group. We are moving as quickly as we can to eliminate them or merge them into larger institutions."

Other hospitals are moving quietly for merger or affiliation with larger institutions.

Not all the small voluntaries have bad records. A few, through mighty efforts and devotion of staff and doctors, have managed to keep care at high quality. But they are very few indeed.

In the meantime, physicians continue to send their patients into these places and sometimes there is trouble.

A young woman has a baby delivered by Caesarean section; the doctor was not qualified to perform the operation.

SCRUTINY

The operating room logbook showed a number of operations performed by certain doctors. The names of the physicians could not be found in any of the official listings of doctors.

A hospital got wind of an impending visit by a special committee to study long-stay patients. Seven of these patients, who were there longer than 30 days, were discharged on Sunday, the day before the visit.

A small hospital with ambulance service received a series of severe-injury patients. Emergency room lacked equipment and staff to handle them.

Most hospital experts agree that small size limits a hospital's medical competence and operating efficiency.

On medical competence, the evidence is overwhelming. For example, in New York a good hospital should have a good teaching

program for doctors. A teaching program, they say, improves the care of the patients because medical students keep older doctors on their toes. When doctors know they are being watched, they perform better.

Further, a teaching program provides round-the-clock doctors' surveillance because interns and residents, who are doctors, are on duty. And if a hospital wants interns and residents it must provide good teachers, good equipment, and enough patients to study.

Under the rules of the American Medical Association, a hospital must have at least 150 beds to operate an approved internship program. That requirement immediately eliminate 21 of the small voluntaries, which have fewer than 150 beds.

SHORTCOMINGS

Even if a hospital is approved for an internship—the lowest rung of clinical education—that does not mean it will attract interns. Since there are fewer American medical school graduates each year than available internships, many go unfilled or are filled with graduates of foreign medical schools.

Some of the small voluntaries "buy" their interns abroad, promising them medical education and enough money to live handsomely. When the "intern" arrives he finds no medical teaching program and discovers that he has actually become an indentured medical factotum.

In the realm of specialty training—the residencies—the picture is far worse. Here the A.M.A. and the specialty organizations require good medical supervision, equipment and enough patients for the training doctor to work on.

Yet very few small voluntaries have approved programs in all four basic specialties: medicine, surgery, obstetrics-gynecology and pediatrics. Fewer still have approvals for anesthesiology, pathology or radiology. And at least a dozen lack approvals in all seven.

In some of the small voluntaries, lack of such teaching programs does not necessarily mean that its doctors are not good. Many top specialists in large voluntary hospitals use small voluntaries as "overflow" hospitals when they cannot get a patient admitted to a big center.

PAY

However, it is no secret in hospital circles that New York City contemplates using residency programs as a hallmark of quality of care. The city pays out some $50 million to all voluntary hospitals for the care of indigent patients. About 15 percent of this goes to small voluntaries.

If the city requires a hospital to have approved residency programs in medicine and surgery to be eligible for payments, about 17 hospitals will lose their city income entirely. This step would put enormous pressure on these institutions: for some, city payments constitute nearly 25 percent of all income.

The city has already started to crack down on those voluntary hospitals which keep patients to get city money even though there is no medical indication for hospitalization. Dr. Ray E. Trussell, commissioner of hospitals, recently put the situation this way:

"The 'survival' patient is an administrative designation of mine to characterize patients who are kept in hospitals at public expense for unnecessary prolonged stays in order to maintain income.

"The hospitals which are characterized by larger proportions of very long-stay patients in their census are usually professionally weak and financially desperate. Any sudden removal of city-charge, long-stay patients from any one of these institutions could cause a closing of the doors forever."

Dr. Trussell did not name names, but a study done by Columbia University in 1961 indicated that small voluntaries and one large voluntary in financial difficulty were the worst offenders.

Small size limits medical competence in many other subtle ways. Take laboratories. To operate a good laboratory, a hospital needs a full-time pathologist, an M.D. who is well versed in laboratory techniques. It also requires skilled technicians.

A hospital with 50, 100, or even 150 beds would be hard pressed to hire a pathologist at $25,000 a year. So many hospitals share pathologists who oversee the laboratories on a part-time basis. It doesn't work.

Dr. Morris Schaeffer, director of the city health department's bureau of laboratories, has given mystery specimens to those small hospital laboratories. They flunk miserably. Half the time they could not make a bacteria diagnosis; they would mess up blood groups and spoil simple chemical determinations.

"The small voluntary hospitals," he said, "had records as a group as bad as the proprietary hospitals." The latter group, Dr. Schaeffer discovered, had the worst performance of any in the city. On the basis of those findings plus other irregularities in proprietary (profitmaking) hospital operations, the city recently adopted a stringent proprietary hospital code.

Except for inspections of laboratories and infant nurseries by the city health department and the threat of the withdrawal of city-charge patients, the city can do little to regulate the voluntary hospitals.

BEYOND REACH

Under State law, voluntary hospitals fall under the jurisdiction of the State department of social welfare. This department has 10 inspectors, all nurses, and two supervisors to inspect 85 municipal and voluntary hospitals, 101 homes for the aged, 47 dispensaries, 50 temporary shelters, and 6 public home infirmaries, a total of 289 institutions.

By contrast, the city department of hospitals has 40 inspectors plus 4 doctors and a supervisor to watch over 80 proprietary hospitals and 47 private nursing homes, a total of 127 institutions.

The State department of social welfare visits each voluntary hospital once a year; the city's inspectors check proprietaries every 3 months.

"We are doing the best we can," says Mrs. Vivian Bucknan, who is in charge of the State's inspection team.

The State has an interim set of regulations on which it has been working for nearly 4 years but which have not yet been adopted by the State board of social welfare. The wheels of State government grind slowly.

In any case, the document leaves to the hospitals the qualifications of the doctors who practice in them. In the proprietary hospital code these qualifications are set by law.

Further, State inspectors adopt an attitude of supervision and consultation rather than inspection and enforcement.

"After all," Mrs. Bucknan says, "these are voluntary institutions. They want to do a good job. And by and large they do. We find in New York City we have not had to close a hospital for violations."

However, Mrs. Bucknan acknowledged that small hospitals have more nursing and technical personnel vacancies than large hospitals have. "In some places in this city," she said, "it isn't safe for a nurse to be out at night."

Many hospital men criticize the State code because it is weak in setting standards of medical care and because it is being administered by an agency more concerned with welfare than with health and hospitals. There is considerable discussion at State levels about the advisability of transferring this duty to the department of health.

Smallness gets in the way of medical care by eliminating necessary equipment. Dr. Martin Cherkasky, president of the Greater New York Hospital Association, points out that a small hospital may have enough equipment to handle a small medical problem.

"The hitch is," he says, "is to be caught in a little place with a big problem."

As medicine advances, Dr. Cherkasky says, more equipment, better laboratories, and more nursing are needed. A hospital with fewer than 200 beds cannot afford these medical luxuries.

Ideally, a small hospital should transfer difficult cases to a big center and a big center should move its easy ones, to the small hospital. "It doesn't work out that way," Dr. Cherkasky says, "doctors take an intimate interest in their patients. They sometimes act as though they own their patients and they don't let go."

NEW RULE

On efficiency, the evidence is also against small hospitals. A State law passed in 1964 gave power of life and death over new hospitals in the city to the Hospital Review and Planning Council of Southern New York. The council is made up of outstanding medical and hospital experts in the city.

The council stated that it would disapprove construction of any hospital, voluntary or proprietary, which had fewer than 200 beds, except in extreme circumstances. At the moment, the council is leaning toward, and probably will adopt, a new standard for New York City of a minimum of 350 beds.

Under this standard, 62 of the voluntary hospitals in this city would never have been built. Their total capacity of 11,000 beds represents just half of the voluntary hospital beds in this city.

REAR ENTRANCE

Inefficiencies creep in by the back door. A small hospital has more trouble keeping its beds full because of restrictions of room availability. A full hospital is an efficient hospital.

Dr. Haldeman, of the hospital council, points out that smallness breeds nursing inefficiencies, too. An ideal nursing unit consists of 35 beds, he says. A small hospital would find it more difficult to group its units into 35-bed sizes.

Purchasing, linen supplies, cleaning, maintenance, administration, and food service all suffer in the small hospital from high-unit costs. In brief, it costs less for each towel, for each cup of soup, for each hospital record if you deal with 500 of them rather than with 50 or 100.

Dr. Haldeman says that the council has been refusing permission for small hospitals to modernize their plants. "They would be throwing good money after bad," he says.

As a result, merger talks have been going on. Some mergers have already been announced. Monsignor Frawley of catholic charities, had indicated that mergers and closings are in the planning stages in his group of hospitals. In the Brooklyn diocese where there is the heaviest concentration of small religious hospitals, there is strong talk of mergers, too. Msgr. Joseph F. Brophy, Monsignor Frawley's counterpart in Brooklyn, refuses to discuss them, but he says there will be an announcement soon.

Among nonsectarian hospitals, similar moves are being made. Hospitals supported by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies went through a consolidation about a decade ago.

A SOLUTION

"It will take about ten years to complete the consolidation of all the little hospitals around New York," Dr. Haldeman says, "All we need is money."

The council has calculated that the city's hospitals need about $390 million to repair and rejuvenate themselves. And this money

is needed for all of them. Nobody seems to know where it will come from. The Federal Government has cut back on funds for new city hospital construction now that most of the rural hospitals have been built.

New York State's constitution forbids the State to appropriate funds for voluntary hospital construction; thus it would take an amendment to get State money for this project. Dr. Haldeman points out that California will match Federal money for voluntary hospital construction.

As for the city, it has its own hospital burden—rebuilding Harlem, Kings County and Bellevue Hospitals, upgrading medical care in other hospitals, and providing long-term care for indigent patients.

In the meantime, small hospitals will continue to take care of patients—sometimes a Caesarean section will be done by an unqualified surgeon; sometimes an ambulance will arrive with a case too difficult for the emergency room; and sometimes you might get stuck in a small place with a big problem.

FIREARMS LEGISLATION IS NEEDED NOW

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced three bills to increase control on the sale and use of firearms and other dangerous weapons.

The first of these bills would require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia. It is similar to my bill, H.R. 637, which I introduced on January 4, 1965, and was transmitted to the Congress by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to implement part of President Johnson's message on the District of Columbia contained in House Document 86.

The bill is explained in some detail in the following letter from Commissioner Tobriner which accompanied the draft proposal:

MARCH 16, 1965.

The Honorable THE SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a bill "To require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

This bill implements the President's message to the Congress on matters relating to the District of Columbia (House Document 86). In discussing the crime situation, the President stated that—

"Some control of firearms within the District is urgently needed. Legislation providing for the registration of pistols, which is an appropriate first step, will shortly be transmitted to the Congress by the Commissioners."

Existing law permits the responsible and law-abiding citizens to possess a pistol in his home or place of business without a license. The bill does not change existing law in this respect.

The principal purposes of the bill are two:

1. To require registration of pistols owned or possessed within the District of Columbia.

2. To forbid ownership or possession of pistols by persons having certain dangerous or irresponsible characteristics.

Meaningful criminal sanctions to enforce these requirements are contained in the bill.

The registration requirement is designed to put on record the identity of each pistol within the District of Columbia and of each person having ownership or possession of a pistol. This will, we believe, provide data which will aid the police in the solution of crimes committed with pistols (almost all crimes committed with firearms in the District of Columbia are committed with pistols).

Crimes committed with pistols in the District, as in other large cities of the United States, have been steadily on the increase in the past few years. The Commissioners and the Federal authorities believe that one factor has been the easy availability of pistols. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, stated in June of 1963 that—

"The easy accessibility of firearms is a significant factor in murders committed in the United States today * * *

"Guns are by far the most lethal weapons used in assaults to kill—seven times more deadly than all other weapons combined."

We believe that an important step in reducing the crime rate is to provide tighter legal control over the acquisition, possession, and records of pistols.

Pistols were used in the District of Columbia in 24 homicides in fiscal year 1962. This number increased to 37 in fiscal year 1964. The number used in aggravated assaults in the 1962 fiscal year was 393. This number increased to 467 in the fiscal year 1964. The number of pistols used in robberies in fiscal year 1962 was 262, and in 1964 the number increased to 482. Thus, nearly 1,000 violent crimes involved the use of pistols in the fiscal year 1964. These statistics do not fully state the magnitude of the danger of pistols, since they measure only actual crimes of violence, taking no account of pistols carried illegally, which are instantly capable of violent use.

The major changes in the law proposed by title I of the bill would:

1. Require registration with the Chief of Police of pistols.

2. Provide criminal penalties for possession of unregistered pistols.

The major changes proposed by title II would:

1. Add new categories of persons prohibited from possessing pistols. These would be persons convicted of misdemeanors involving the use of pistols, persons under 21 years of age (except while actually engaged as a regularly enrolled member in the activities of an organization authorized to receive pistols from the U.S. Government), frequent offenders involved in drunken driving or habitual intoxication, and persons found to have mental disorders. Under existing law, only four categories of persons are prohibited from possessing pistols. They are (a) drug addicts, (b) persons convicted in the District or elsewhere of a felony, (c) persons convicted of prostitution, keeping a disorderly house, or vagrancy, and (d) persons not licensed to sell guns and convicted of violating the Dangerous Weapons Act.

2. Increase penalties for illegally carrying a pistol on one's person or possessing certain prohibited dangerous weapons, such as machineguns.

3. Increase from 48 to 120 hours the time for police to investigate the qualifications of a prospective purchaser of a pistol, before delivery may be made.

In developing the bill, the Commissioners had the close cooperation and assistance of Mr. David C. Acheson, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners most strongly urge enactment of the bill.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that this bill is consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

The second bill that I have introduced today would amend the Federal Firearms Act to prohibit the mail-order sales of firearms to individuals by limiting firearms shipments in interstate commerce to shipments between importers, manufacturers and dealers. It also prohibits sales of all types of firearms to persons under 21 years of age except sporting rifles and shotguns. The bill contains a number of other provisions which I believe to be essential in the proper regulation of firearms and is calculated to implement part of President Johnson's attack on the problem of rising crime in this country. It is similar to my bill, H.R. 1110, which I introduced on January 4, 1965.

The third bill I have introduced today would impose special taxes on the importing, manufacturing and dealing in destructive weapons and would increase the rates of existing taxes.

Both of these latter proposals have been sponsored in the other body by our distinguished former colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut.

I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Ways and Means, to which my bill, H.R. 1110, and the two bills amending the Federal Firearms Act and National Firearms Act, that I have introduced today, have been referred, will schedule hearings on these proposals in the very near future. Similarly, I hope that the Committee on the District of Columbia will schedule hearings on H.R. 637.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, how appropriate it is for us today, in commemoration of Byelorussian independence, not only to recall the very valiant act of these people in declaring their sovereignty as a nation, but in a larger sense to realize the universal implications of their bold declaration.

For the Byelorussians emerged more than victors over centuries of oppression when they declared their independance in 1918; their victory was a victory for all men in their belief that they inherently possess the right to be free.

As our distinguished Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated, in speaking of the American Declaration of Independence:

These principles were set forth not as the special property of the inhabitants of the British Colonies in North America but as

universal truths, applicable to all men and for all time.

And, over the decades, the appeal of these principles has endured and broadened. Could there be more eloquent testimony to this truth than the Byelorussian declaration which came nearly a century and a half later?

It is these principles which the Byelorussians courageously fought to uphold and worked to preserve that we share with men and women in every other country. Thus, it is more than sadness we feel when we recall that the Byelorussians, as many others, are not really free; it is more than sympathy that we express when we see their bondage.

On this day of remembrance of Byelorussian independence we are reminded of our President's thoughts when he said, "We have worked to help the nations of Eastern Europe move toward independence. This is their people's goal and this is our people's continuing resolve."

That freedom and independence will once again be a reality for the Byelorussian nation is our fervent hope, Mr. Speaker, as we remember with admiration our Byelorussian friends.

THE ROAD TO FREEDOM IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum from the 11th session of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, Document No. 393, dated March 24, 1965:

THE ROAD TO FREEDOM IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

I

The prevalent view in the West is that the situation in Europe has undergone a significant change for the better during the last 2 years. Fully absorbed by the rift with Red China, by difficulties with its Eastern European satellites and by domestic problems, the Soviet Union is supposed to have dropped any expansionist aim in Europe. Preoccupation with the war in Vietnam and economic prosperity, as well as an overoptimistic assessment of developments in east-central Europe, further feed the impression that Western Europe is not only secure but can look forward patiently to the gradual recession of Soviet influence.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations cannot share this optimistic evaluation of recent events in Europe. In the view of the assembly, one can at best speak of a change of Soviet tactics in Europe. The policy of intimidation, as symbolized by the Berlin ultimatum (1958–62), foundered on the shores of Cuba. The emphasis is now on political penetration through the old device of popular fronts. The new, nationalist and moderate, image some of the Western European Communist Parties are striving to project is likely to serve this purpose regardless whether or not it was a genuine emancipation from a rigid, Moscow-set course of policy. But this new emphasis on political penetration in no way excludes the danger of a return to the policy of intimidation. The possibility, indeed, that Moscow may revert sooner or later to the attempt of gaining ground by pressures, backed up by conventional military power, cannot be discarded. In this context, the practical deterrent influence the nations of Eastern Europe represent, to the extent they endanger Soviet lines of communication, constitutes a factor of Western European security which cannot and should not be neglected.

There can be no doubt that the Communist world is beset with troubles. The deepening Moscow-Peiping rift, the instability inherent in the collective-type of leadership the Soviet Union has had since the ouster of Khrushchev, the structural crisis of Communist agriculture, the more and more obvious inadequacy of rigid economic planning—are undeniably hampering Soviet expansionism.

But these developments should not obscure the fact that Communist aims have not changed; that Soviet military power remains deployed in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and the Baltic States, that is, in the heart of Europe; that the apparently increased autonomy of the Communist Parties in Western Europe enhances their effectiveness; that the new projection of the satellites as genuinely independent removes an important obstacle to Communist advances through political penetration and internal subversion; that the widely heralded changes in Eastern Europe have not altered the nature of the Communist regimes or their basic, if less evident, dependence on Moscow; that these changes are designed to make the Communist system work and thus render it domestically more acceptable and internationally more respectable.

If one is mindful of the divergencies which have developed recently within the Western Alliance and of the slackening of the sense of danger in Europe under the impact of a rather optomistic view of the crisis the Communist world is undergoing, one can only conclude that difficulties are present on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Opportunities to gain ground, therefore, appear to be open to both the free and the Communist side.

It is the considered view of ACEN that if the free nations hold their ground in the next few years and continue to demonstrate their determination to help the peoples in east-central Europe to recover full freedom and independence, while refraining from actions apt to lend prestige or to help the Communist regimes to solve their serious economic problems, necessity will compel these regimes to adopt more rational ways involving greater freedom of action for economically essential segments of the population, such as the technological and managerial elite and the peasants. Concessions induced by pressure and necessity might unleash an irreversible process of disintegration of the totalitarian pattern. The very nature of the Soviet regime, with its built-in crises of succession and civil war potential, might provide the opportunity for such a process culminating in acts of self-deliverance.

II

To further the process of national and human emancipation in Eastern Europe, it is essential to distinguish carefully between the peoples of east-central Europe, the potential allies of the West, and the Communist rulers who keep them in bondage.

It is imperative to avert any kind of actions apt to be construed as acceptance of the finality of the political status quo in Eastern Europe.

It is most useful to indicate by appropriate diplomatic actions awareness that uniting Europe in its natural borders and making it politically, militarily and economically self-reliant is, in the long run, the only sound and dependable foundation for peace and security in the key area of Europe.

It is necessary to show awareness of the fact that in spite of the differences from one Eastern European country to another, their situation is fundamentally the same. Their relationship to the Soviet Union cannot be defined in terms of an alliance or a mutual security arrangement. The Soviet Government guarantees, indeed, the Communist regimes against their internal enemies rather than national territory against external aggression. The certainty of Soviet intervention acts as a deterrent upon the ruled and an assurance to the rulers. In such conditions the attitude of the majority toward the regimes remains one of mute hostility. This hostility and the pressures it causes, chiefly in the form of noncooperation and other types of passive resistance, is a proven source of positive changes, particularly when it goes hand in hand with steady pressures from without. It creates, moreover, for the Soviet Union a risk factor, which has played in the past and, given the growing nuclear stalemate, may again play in the future an important deterrent role to Soviet aggressiveness.

One can hardly stress enough that the diminution of unnecessary terror in east-central Europe, on the pattern adopted in the Soviet Union, does not mean a basic change in the Communist system. The dictatorial rule by a single party, a minority group, supported by policy and military forces, remains the essential feature of the Communist regimes. The freedoms of speech, press, assembly and association are still denied in east-central Europe. There is no multiparty system, in spite of the nominal existence, in some countries, of sham peasant or democratic parties which have adopted the platform of the Communist Party and have acknowledged its "leading role." The "elections" are still held with single governmental lists. There are no opposition candidates. This one-party system is basically the same in the nine captive countries, in spite of some differences in the degree of police control and of the operation of the economic system. Guarantees against arbitrary arrest and detention and the rule of law are still conspicuous by their absence. Religion and churches continue to be persecuted.

In all the East European countries the peasants constitute the majority of the population. But, with the single exception of Poland, they have been deprived of their freedom and their land by collectivization, which was enforced in most of the area during the last decade, after the death of Stalin. Consequently, the peasants are deeply hostile to the dictatorship of the Communist minority.

III

For all these reasons it is incumbent upon the Assembly of Captive European Nations to stress that, both in the short- and long-term perspective, the Western Powers have a vital stake in the friendship of the peoples of Eastern Europe and a clear interest in fostering among them the belief that there is for them reasonable hope of deliverance.

In this conviction, the Assembly appeals to the governments and peoples of the free world, and particularly to the U.S. Government:

1. To reaffirm at every appropriate occasion the validity of the wartime and postwar legal commitments and pledges with respect to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania and to ask compliance therewith;

2. To call before the United Nations and in negotiations with the Soviet Union for an all-European settlement based on the right of self-determination and to seek the withdrawal of Soviet troops from east-central Europe, the restoration of political and human rights and free elections under international supervision;

3. To demand a United Nations inquiry of the state of human rights and fundamental freedoms in east-central Europe, including an investigation of conditions in prisons and forced-labor camps;

4. To exact—as proposed by the Executive Council of the AFL–CIO in its statement of March 1, 1965—in return for whatever credits or other economic advantages the free nations may deem expedient to grant, commensurate concessions in the form of: (a) effective and self-enforcing measures to assure the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms to the peoples of east-central Europe; (b) changes in the economic policies of the Communist regimes designed to foster social welfare and do away with the present, politically motivated but economically deficient course of policy, both in agriculture and industry; and (c) hard and fast commitments to put an end to Soviet economic exploitation by means of discriminatory prices in the foreign trade between the Soviet Union and the individual east-central European countries and thus make certain that Western credits will not indirectly subsidize the economy of the Soviet Union.

THE HAMMOND PICTORIAL HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, at this time of moral crisis in our Nation's history, as dramatized by the unhappy events in Selma, Ala., I should like to call attention to the thoughtful comments of that distinguished Negro historian, Dr. Charles H. Wesley, of Central State College at Wilberforce, Ohio, in his foreword to the forthcoming "Pictorial History of the American Negro" being published by C. S. Hammond & Co. of Maplewood, N.J.

FOREWORD

(By Charles H. Wesley [1])

Pictures of the American nation of peoples would be composed of various minority groups, each of whom has been contributing through the years to the development of American life and history. Many races, cultures, and peoples have found their homes in this, the land of the free, and an American picture should include all of them. It is well known that lines have been drawn and that there have been omission and separation of peoples on the basis of religions, language, race, and color. These peoples have come from England, Ireland, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and all Europe, parts of Asia, and the islands, but it must be remembered, also, that millions came from Africa. This land in history has had civilizations, cultures, and governments in ancient and medieval periods, prior to the rise of the devastating slave trade, which were just as valuable and as glorious to history as those in Europe prior to the rise of its national states. From the 16th century through to the middle of the 19th century, within the law and outside of the law, the descendants of Africa were brought involuntarily, as others had come voluntarily and involuntarily, to the Western World. We are a nation of immigrants, or the descendants of immigrants, none of whom has a priority in history's esteem.

The Negro population has grown through the years until it now constitutes the largest minority group of the American population, and, next to the Indian population, is the oldest of America's minority groups. Negroes arrived in the area of the United States nearly a century prior to the founding of the first English colony, having come with Spanish explorers, but not as slaves, and having been participants in a settlement in Virginia in 1528. It is important that this length of continuing residence be known since there has been some tendency to regard the Negro as one of the out-groups in America, who should return to his native land, rather than as American, and accordingly can be omitted from word and pictorial presentations of America.

This group of Americans, as have other groups, has made significant contributions to American life and culture. These contributions have been made by individuals and they have been made by the group, despite disadvantages, discriminations, and separations from the mainstream of American life. The account of these contributions should be better known to all Americans in the interest of the improvement of human relations. In this respect, there is no such thing as "Negro history," or "Jewish history," "Irish history" or other histories, as separate entities or detached contributions to American history. The only reason why there is such a history is the neglect, omission, and distortion of contributions which have been made by these special groups. Too often historians have presented in textbooks the story of one group, and for them have told this story well; but they have neglected to present the story concerning other groups of people. The result has been that it has required many years and special endeavors to call to the attention of the textbook writers, the historians, the social scientists, and the people who read, who look, and who think, that peoples of different colors and cultures have also contributed to American history. For these reasons, the Hammond Pictorial History of the American Negro has significance and definite meaning for all Americans.

This picture history * * * carries the observer through the American colonial period, the institution of slavery, the irrepressible conflict, the effects of Jim Crow, the migrations to the North and to cities, the changes in the Negro status, the decisions of the courts, the marches to freedom, and the Negro today. Pictures from many sources are presented in this unusual presentation with brief descriptive and dramatic wording.

In this connection, Samuel Taylor Coleridge in his "A Day-Dream" writes: "My eyes make pictures when they are shut." Pictures in eyes that are shut have been made of the Negro in history, and have been supported and developed by lack of information and personal contacts. In fact, in order that people may understand people, information is not enough. There must be learning experiences, eyes must be opened to see pictures rather than permit the eyes to be closed and maintain the same false and incorrect pictures which have been learned from an earlier generation, parents at home, uninterested and biased teachers at school, and from people in the streets. The home, the school, and the neighborhood are the places where boys and girls are first "carefully taught" the ideas, the concepts, the pictures, and the word pictures which are fundamental in their adult lives for the characterizations of darker Americans. The images which they receive are often maintained throughout their years.

Moreover, if a Negro youth is unable to identify himself with those who are seen in pictures of American life because their very appearance seems to denote for them a superiority, he can so readily assume his own inferiority. This reaction is described by Booker T. Washington as a youth in his "The Story of the Negro," as he described a picture in his first geography used in the elementary grades. The book had on one page a picture of George Washington and beside him was a picture of a naked African with a ring in his nose and a dagger in his hand. This type of presentation has created bad reactions from white and black youth, the former through assumptions of superiority and the latter of inferiority.

It is the challenging task of publications, teachers, schools, and community agencies to remove and reconstruct the basic false concept, to give new experiences and impressions in the interest of good human relations, and to substitute new pictures and truthful images, so that the stereotypes of difference and inferiority can be removed. Even if youth should have in earlier years the implanting of correct ideas, memory can be very short, the impressions of the environment are deepened vigorously, and imagination of them can be much longer. The images oftimes outlast the words, even when allied with fact. And yet, the once learned fact can be erased by a fertile imagination stimulated by separations, innuendoes, and disparagement, but the picture can remain. Words may fade, but pictures fade less often and they can continue to exist in the subconscious self. Making history graphic through pictures is a most important step in the current educational program.

This is basic in the quest for background by Negro youths and adults in the United States. Unfortunately, there is a self-image of depreciation created by the Negro people of themselves. It is not a consciously adopted image created by them. There are facts which they face in their environment that create and reinforce the image. There can be a change in this self-picture when the facts and the inspiration for the future can be directed for definite purposes. When they see themselves as inferiors and are conditioned as intellectually and culturally incompetent, and there are no evidences in books and classrooms to oppose, delimit, or explain this conclusion, there is frustration, defeatism, and reaction against others.

Negroes have undertaken to do something about this. They have organized the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, and have been publishing studies, textbooks, and individual pictures of prominent Negroes, which have been placed on the walls of schools, colleges, universities, and institutions, so that more correct views can be secured of these aspects of Negro life and history. The strength of the forces seeking to keep the Negro in his place, and to have him as a despised person, had been so great that it is necessary to have all avenues of education used in order to bring to the masses of Americans new and truer views concerning Negro-Americans. In such situations, pictures have value, and particularly pictures which show that the participants are, after all, human beings, Americans at work and at play, striving for advanced status as citizens, searching for the ways of freedom known to other Americans, learning activities valuable to the community when they are accepted or have the opportunity.

Such pictures * * * are not primarily for entertainment, and they should be connected with the appropriate discussion in words which should also lead to additional reading. There is need in Negro history for historical books, documents, and primary sources on solid historical foundations. There is need for interpretation, brilliant narration, and sound teaching of the facts of unknown Negro history. There is also a definite need of pictures, portraitures, and pictorial pres-

[1] President of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Washington, D.C.

entations for the study of Negro history and minor scenes, some with completeness and others with less completeness. The picture can become the gateway to a larger learning.

There are scenes herewith in the history of the current freedom movement, which can lead to the development of understanding and esteem for its leadership, its demonstrations by youth from the schools, colleges, and universities and the sacrifices in money and themselves by dedicated men and women, white and black. There are scenes of misguided white Americans clad in robes and hoods who rudely and violently block the free pathways of American democracy, revealing their crude efforts to keep the Negro in his place. Scenes appear of Negro groups who, because they have freed themselves from fear itself, march nonviolently along the road to freedom, refusing as Americans to be ignored, neglected, or denied. Such pictures, even when eyes are shut, will not leave undisturbed the onlooker and the reader.

The ultimate test of the value of these pictures can be found in the changed attitude which disregards color and ethnic divisions and uses it as an integral aspect of the total American scene. When eyes that have been shut have made incorrect pictures, they should be opened to the realities of these pictures which are descriptive of the Negro-American's history, and they may lead toward the truth, and finally to changes in attitude and in behavior. Through these channels, some southerners and some northerners may then free their minds and eyes of the stereotypes which have violated the truth for so long a period as well as the American dream itself. Seeing truly and really, they may reject the slanted newspaper interpretations, and discard the inherited local caricature and burlesque of the American with the darker skin.

Just as the maps, charts, and graphics of C. S. Hammond & Co. have given Americans world understanding of international problems, scenes, and peoples, it is more than probable that the wider distribution of these pictures of our national scenes will have similar effects within the Nation. Since the dramatics of the Negro revolution have been treated and editorialized in varying ways by writers and observers, and by the many representatives of the press of the Nation, it is in this context that this presentation of pictures has definite values.

PATMAN'S BELIEFS

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, more so than not, men through history who have taken courageous stands and have fought for the best interest of the general welfare, have often been misinterpreted, misquoted, and misunderstood.

Although there are many people who both understand and admire the distinguished dean of the Texas delegation, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, there has never been enough said about the House Banking and Currency chairman's battles for the people.

Therefore, I would like to share with you Chairman PATMAN'S letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal which appeared March 23, 1965, in which he clarifies a misinterpretation of his proposals:

REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN'S BELIEFS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I enjoy reading the comics in most newspapers. I like Peanuts, Li'l Abner, Penny, and many others.

One comic page that I look at occasionally I find more amusing than the others. It is the page of The Wall Street Journal that carries the editorials. It portrays so vividly the viewpoint of those who believe in the divine right of money kings. Consequently, it is really hilarious.

For example, an editorial called "Behind the Fiscal Fog" (March 4) sets out to make it appear that I am in favor of "printing press" money because I had the temerity to suggest that we may be paying bankers too much to finance government securities (State and local as well as Federal), and that it might be possible to save the taxpayers enormous sums of money and avoid an increase in the deficit by having the Federal Reserve System at least assist in government financing.

It's perfectly all right, according to those who believe in the divine right of money kings, for commercial banks to manufacture money on the credit of all the people for the prime benefit of the few—big bankers, that is. This is not inflationary. It would only be inflationary, according to the Wall Street Journal, if the Government were to have the Federal Reserve System purchase its notes at, let us say, one-quarter or one-half or three-quarters of 1 percent. This would bring about "printing press" money by cranking up the "overworked currency printing press."

To keep the record straight—for the 6 World War II years, mid-1940 to mid-1946, the total Federal deficit (net borrowings) was a little over $199 billion, which was financed through Government offerings of not over 2.5 percent; much of it ranging from seven-eighths of 1 percent down to one-eighth of 1 percent.

This financing was done during the most widespread and savage war in all history, without resorting to any overworked printing press. It would seem to me that the credit of all the people in this, the most financially sound and wealthiest Nation on earth, might be similarly extended during peacetime to allow low interest rate governmental borrowings from America's central bank, the Federal Reserve System—without resorting to any overworked currency printing press.

This would tremendously ease the burden on the taxpayer. I admit that commercial banks would lose some of the especial benefits they now derive from buying high interest rate governments on the credit of all the people of this Nation.

What the Wall Street Journal wants is obviously what the banking establishment wants; namely, a double cost for all governmental projects. It is fair to assume that borrowings by various governments—State, local, and Federal—for long-range projects many times call for 25-year loans. A reasonable cost for such loans in the present market would approach 4, 5, or even 6 percent, so that over a 25-year period or less, the interest cost paid would equal the total amount of money borrowed. A billion dollars for projects, a billion or more for private banks. A million dollars for a schoolhouse, a million or more for private banking institutions.

I believe this toll is too heavy and can be eliminated. I believe the way to eliminate most of it merely calls for the Federal Reserve banks to buy legitimate governmental securities, municipal, State, and Federal, for a service charge of less than 1 percent.

I do not believe in the equity of a double toll charge, as does the Wall Street Journal. Bankers need not profit on poverty elimination, education, farm and urban renewal, mass transit, and a hundred other benefits the most prosperous Nation on earth can well afford provided the citizens are not suffocated by high and unnecessary interest charges.

While I have been rather critical of what I have termed your comic page, I do wish to commend you and your working newsmen for turning out a very valuable financial newspaper.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives.

FREE AMMUNITION AGENCY PROJECTS RECORD BUDGET

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recent newspaper stories have reported that the Army's free gun and ammunition program is to be curbed. According to one story, the Army plans to tighten control over the program, which goes under the name of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and the Office of Civilian Marksmanship, and is revising its system of giving or selling guns to civilians. Another story states that the entire subsidy—free ammunition, guns and other services—is being reexamined by the Defense Department.

I have been alerting the public about the dangers of this loosely organized gun and ammunition subsidy for almost a year and there is nothing I would welcome more than official notice or even unofficial knowledge that the Army or the Defense Department plans a crackdown. But while stories and rumors of curbs, cutbacks and controls are being reported in the press, the gun and ammo give-away program is growing and expanding. Proof of this may be seen in the new budget for fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. For the talk is about tighter controls, but the facts as shown by the budget are that the program is scheduled to expand in fiscal year 1966. According to the budget, the dollar value of ammunition issued without charge in 1964 was $1,434,000. The estimated value of ammunition given away in fiscal year 1965 is $1,684,000. And the estimated value of ammunition to be given away in fiscal year 1966 is $1,796,000. The free ammunition is the most impotrant part of the program and the costliest.

The reports of the controls and curbs have been attributed to officials in the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army. But these officials have not been named or identified.

My interest in the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice goes back almost a year when I discovered the extensive guns and ammo giveaway that it promotes. Beginning in May of last year I began a series of speeches delivered before this House in which I explained in detail not only the manner in which this giant subsidy operates to benefit the

National Rifle Association and private gun clubs throughout the Nation, but also how extreme right-wing organizations like the Minutemen were exploiting the program to arm themselves. More than 400,000 persons belong to gun clubs receiving free guns and ammunition. How many of these are right-wing extremists, members of the Minutemen, or other self-styled para-military groups no one seems to know. Least of all does the Defense Department or the Army know because of the laxity and looseness with which this program is handled. But the leaders of the Minutemen and other extremists regularly advise their followers and dupes to form gun clubs, affiliate with the NRA, and get their supply of free guns and ammunition.

It is no wonder that over the last 5 years membership in the NRA nearly doubled while at the same time the Army was giving it almost $12 million in subsidies.

On May 26, 1964, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense to express my fears that the Civilian Marksmanship program had gotten out of hand and was being used by right-wing extremists, and to raise a number of questions about costs to the Federal Government. On July 15, 1964, I received my answer from the Department of the Army to which my letter had been referred. The costs of the program had been ever greater than I had supposed. From 1959 to 1964 the Army had given away to private gun clubs 246.9 million rounds of free ammunition costing $7.2 million. In the same period, the Army had placed $2.3 million worth of guns on loan to gun clubs. In the same period the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice had spent $2.5 million to conduct rifle matches and other activities.

These facts were brought out for the first time as a result of my initial letter to the Defense Department and after considerable prodding. For during the 7 weeks it took for an answer to come back, numerous XXXXXXXXXX calls had to be made to the Pentagon to remind the Defense Establishment that my letter had not been answered. Still, an answer was finally made, and I am grateful for that.

I frankly do not know whether to be grateful or not for the recent batch of rumors about tighter controls and curbs. Of course, I have been urging tighter controls and curbs on this guns and ammo subsidy for almost a year. Of course, I have been warning my colleagues and the people about the dangers of this program for almost a year. Obviously, I would be delighted to learn that the rumors, attributed by the newspapers to anonymous officials, were true. But there stands the new budget, in complete contradiction to the rumors of cutbacks, projecting future estimates for fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1966 not of reductions but of increases—substantial increases.

Anyone who can reconcile the rumors with the facts is welcome to try. He should begin by explaining how it is a reduction of the guns and ammo giveaway program to hand out $1,434,000 worth of free ammunition to private gun clubs in 1964, to hand out $1,684,000 worth of free ammunition in 1965, and to hand out $1,796,000 worth of free ammunition in 1966. How does one curb a free ammunition subsidy by giving away $362,000 worth of free ammunition more in 1966 than in 1964?

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Post, March 21, 1964, well written by Rasa Gustaitis; an article that appeared in the Washington Star, March 14, 1965; and an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal, March 9, 1965:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 14, 1965]

ARMY TO CURB LOANS OF GUNS

The Army plans to tighten control over its loans of arms to gun clubs and its gun sales to individual members of the National Rifle Association, it was learned yesterday.

Proposed changes in the Army's methods of distributing its guns to civilians were prompted by the President's forthcoming gun legislation and widely expressed fears that Army guns may fall into the hands of rightwing extremists.

Under the Army program now being developed, States would know which of their residents were getting Army guns as well as the serial numbers of the weapons.

Guns would be delivered to a central location in each State rather than shipped directly to each gun club by the Army.

An impartial study also is to be made to determine whether the long-established, congressionally authorized National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice serves a useful purpose from the viewpoint of the national defense.

GUN CLUBS AFFECTED

Potentially affected by the Army's revised program are the more than 400,000 members of gun clubs as well as the much larger overall membership of the National Rifle Association.

The President's gun measure due to go to Congress this week, is aimed at helping the States to impose effective controls over firearms within their boundaries.

The Army wants to fit its own civilian marksmanship program into the framework and philosophy of this legislation.

Under the administration's gun legislation, mail-order gun sales to individuals would be halted; gun shipments would be made only among importers, manufacturers and dealers; license fees to deal in guns would go from a nominal to a substantial figure; importation of surplus military weapons would be virtually eliminated, and the sale of firearms to persons under 21 (or under 18 in the case of rifles and shotguns) would be prohibited.

ARMY ACTING

An Army spokesman said that the Army was revising its system of giving or selling guns to civilians so the program can be continued in line with this legislative proposal.

The Army's civilian marksmanship program has been in existence by act of Congress since early in the century. Under its rules clubs requesting to be enrolled must show they have 10 members or more, are NRA-affiliated and have access to a range.

An adult or senior club can get on loan up to eight .30-caliber rifles, four .45-caliber pistols and four .22-caliber rifles.

Recently various members of Congress have protested that the Army is, in effect, "subsidizing" the extremists by lending guns to clubs. They base this on repeated advice to the membership of such groups as the extremists Minutemen to join a gun club.

NO EVIDENCE APPARENT

"This really worries us," acknowledged an Army spokesman. "We don't know enough to say with assurance that we don't have any extremists in the gun clubs but there's nothing to indicate that any member of a gun club was ever involved in inappropriate things. We've asked a number of questions about this to see if we missed anything but no misuse of Army guns by club members is known."

Under the Army's new plans, the States keeping track of the extremists will be able to determine if any of them show up in the ranks of gun clubs receiving Army guns.

The States also will be informed of sales of Army guns to individuals. This is another congressional authorized program. Gun buyers must send in their NRA card, a statement that they are 18 or over, have never purchased a comparable item from the U.S. Government and have taken the NRA pledge. This includes statements that they don't belong to an organization advocating violent overthrow of the Government and have never been convicted of a crime of violence.

Now under consideration is an Army requirement for more positive character assertions by would-be gun buyers so, if they lied, they could be prosecuted for making false statements to the Government.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1965]

GUN CLUBS BLOCK WEAPONS CURBS

(By Rasa Gustaitis)

The fountainhead of the Nation's anti-gun-control lobby is an income-tax-exempt organization that has received more than $12 million in Federal subsidies in the past 5 years.

The subsidy—free ammunition, guns, and other services provided by the Army—has helped the National Rifle Association to nearly double its membership in that period.

This subsidy is now being reexamined by the Defense Department, a spokesman confirmed last week. The program is designed to improve civilian markmanship, but questions have been raised about its merits and about having NRA-affiliated rifle clubs conduct the program.

The NRA now numbers 675,000 members in this country and abroad, plus 462,000 nonmembers in 12,000 affiliated gun clubs. More than a million persons are thus reached by the stream of publications flowing from the association's headquarters at 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW.

And those publications have helped trigger a flood of mail any time a law is proposed to control firearms.

Since the assassination of President Kennedy, no single significant law requiring registration or strict control of weapons has been enacted by Congress, a State, or a major city.

A rifle association policy statement holds that "firearms legislation is of insufficient value in the prevention of crime to justify the inevitable restriction which such legislation places upon law-abiding citizens." The group has consistently opposed most arms control legislation.

The association had $7 million in assets and an annual budget of about $4 million in 1963. It received 64 percent of its income from membership dues, 25 percent from advertisements in its monthly magazine, the American Rifleman, and 11 percent from other services, including sales of its publications.

Last summer, Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Democrat of Texas, asked the Defense Department for information on the Army's programs conducted with NRA members and affiliated clubs.

The Army reply showed that $12 million had been spent since 1959, not including cost of weapons sold at special rates to NRA members. The figures broke down as follows: $7.2 million for 246.9 million rounds of free ammunition supplied to gun clubs from fiscal 1960 to fiscal 1964; $2.3 million worth of guns and equipment on loan to gun clubs; $2.5 million for the Army's National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice to conduct rifle matches and other activities in its civilian marksmanship program.

The National Board was set up by law 62 years ago to provide marksmanship training and enable citizens to become proficient with small arms through a program conducted with the Rifle Association. Last year, 17 of the 25 Board members were also NRA members.

Not included in the $12-million figure is the cost, if any, of the Army's selling 539,267 rifles, shotguns and pistols to NRA members at special rates.

The association is exempt from taxes under the Internal Revenue Code's subsection 501 (c) (4) which exempts "civic leagues or organizations not organized for profit but operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare * * * and the net earnings of which are devoted exclusively to charitable, educational or recreational purposes."

The Rifle Association does not consider itself a lobbying group and is not registered as such with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Yet in a publication it boasts: "No other organization carries on such a continuous and successful effort to inform its members about proposed antigun laws which would restrict the ownership and use of shotgun, handgun and rifle alike."

Jack J. Basil, head of the association's legislative service, states that although legislative bulletins, letters and even telegrams are sent to members, it is up to them to make up their minds.

The bulletins, however, leave no doubt as to what the association considers an intelligent opinion. For example, when a bill was introduced in the Baltimore County Council last year requiring police permission to buy firearms, Frank C. Daniel, NRA secretary, noted in a bulletin:

"The regulation of all private firearms transactions in so large a county where the possibilities of evasion are numerous would create an impossible enforcement problem."

[From the Wall Street Journal]

PRIVATE ARMIES CAUSE CONCERN, SPUR EFFORTS TO TIGHTEN GUN LAWS—MINUTEMEN GIRD TO FIGHT REDS; L.B.J. ASKS CONGRESS TO CURB MAIL ORDER SALES OF WEAPONS

"We've seen our last free election in this Government. Now we'll wait until things get so bad that the American people are willing to support an underground revolution. We wouldn't lead the revolt but we hope we could supply some of the people, the know-how and the material."

This statement is offered in the even, soft drawl of 41-year-old Robert B. de Pugh, of Norborne, Mo. Mr. de Pugh, besides being president of Bio-Lab Pharmaceutical Co., a veterinary medicine concern, is the leader of a militantly anti-Communist organization called the Minutemen. He believes that the Minutemen must be prepared if necessary to repel invaders from abroad or subversion from within the Government with armed force.

But if the Minutemen are worried about Communists, many public officials are just as worried about the Minutemen and similar organizations which have been springing up around the country. A bill now before the California Legislature, aimed at such groups, outlaws two or more people getting together as a "paramilitary organization" to practice with weapons or give instruction in their use. Exempt from the bill would be organizations formed purely for "recreation," and members of the National Guard, college and school military classes and veterans' groups.

Concern about armed extremist groups, combined with anxiety about guns falling into the hands of emotionally disturbed individuals and professional criminals, is spurring other efforts at local, State and Federal levels to tighten controls over the distribution and use of guns. Yesterday President Johnson called on Congress to outlaw mail order sales of guns, reminding the legislators that a mail order rifle was used to assassinate President Kennedy. Many such efforts, however, face stiff opposition from hunters, target shooters, gun collectors and retailers who regard some regulatory proposals as infringements of their constitutional right to "keep and bear arms."

For his part, the Minutemen's Mr. de Pugh says: "No new gun law will hamper us from getting what we need." He adds that "we're pretty proficient in getting them (guns) from our sources," though he won't say what these sources are. Each Minuteman is required to possess a rifle, a sidearm, and 300 rounds of ammunition.

The Minutemen organization is loosely knit, and Mr. de Pugh says this is deliberate. "A definite chain of command is a weakness in a strictly underground movement," he explains. Under Mr. de Pugh are about 50 State or area coordinators, each of whom can operate independently. Below them are "bands," each with a leader. The bands are broken up into anywhere from 2 to 20 "teams" of 6 men each. Mr. de Pugh won't disclose exact membership figures for the Minutemen but he does say that each member has a number and that he has given out 62,000 numbers to State and area coordinators for eventual distribution.

"Our greatest accomplishment is the fact we've developed an organization large enough and diverse enough so that it couldn't possibly be destroyed now," claims Mr. de Pugh.

The U.S. Government, Mr. de Pugh fears, appears to be heading toward "peaceable surrender" to communism. "We're trying to show them the people will fight if the Government doesn't."

A CHANCE TO PRACTICE

Mr. de Pugh encourages Minutemen to join the National Rifle Association and local gun clubs. Such membership, he says, serves "as a cover for our activities and gives us a chance to practice shooting undetected."

Gun clubs approved by the National Rifle Association, State affiliates, and the National Guard are eligible to buy arms at cutrate prices and get free ammunition from the Defense Department under a program aimed at sharpening the skills of civilian marksmen. Mr. de Pugh denies that Minutemen get arms through this program because "those guns are registered and could be confiscated." But California law officials say they suspect that some extremist groups have infiltrated gun clubs or formed their own so they could get weapons from the Government.

Last year, Stanley Mosk, then California attorney general, asked the Defense Department for a list of members of California clubs receiving arms under the marksmanship program. But the National Board To Promote Rifle Practice, which administers the program, said such lists "weren't available." Now Mr. Mosk's successor, Thomas Lynch, plans to try again soon to get the information.

The rifle practice board annually distributes about $1 million worth of guns and ammunition to members of some 5,600 groups, including clubs sponsored by the NRA, Boy Scout groups, veterans' organizations, and even church-affiliated groups. The Army has taken an active interest in civilian sharpshooters since 1903, and members of the rifle practice board claim this interest paid off handsomely during World War II when "thousands" of marksmen from civilian gun clubs served in the Army as shooting instructors.

The National Rifle Association says there is no hard evidence that extremist groups have infiltrated gun clubs it approves. Association officials resent attempts to link the organization, even in the role of an unknowing host, to "private armies and guerrilla forces."

The Defense Department marksmanship program is only one of the concerns of officials and lawmakers worried about guns. They're also trying to enact new laws, or tighten existing legislation, dealing with such things as registration of gun owners and the carrying of concealed weapons.

Advocates of new gun control laws see perhaps their best chance for success in urban areas where politicians aren't subject to pressure from hunters and gun-toting farmers and ranchers. Thus, the Philadelphia City Council is expected soon to approve a firearms registration ordinance which gun enthusiasts bitterly call "the most restrictive of any in the United States." It would require that a Philadelphian be finger-printed, photographed, and approved by police before he could buy or own any kind of gun.

At the State level, since January 1 alone, gun control bills have been introduced in more than a dozen legislatures. But progress in most States is likely to be limited and slow, because legislators will try to avoid "stepping on the toes" of gun enthusiasts.

Bills in Maine and Virginia would tighten laws requiring licenses to carry hidden pistols in the streets. The measures aren't likely to raise violent objections from gun groups since they restrict only the carrying, not the owning of concealable weapons. Sixteen States already forbid anyone but policemen and military personnel from carrying concealed weapons.

The gun groups probably will support proposals in several legislatures to prohibit shooting across highways and to demand proof of competency in weapons handling for teenage gun users. Such provisions already are in effect in many States.

A California legislative committee recently drafted nine bills which primarily tighten laws on pistols, revolvers, and machineguns. The package represents a compromise with gun enthusiasts, and one lobbyist for gun organizations describes it as a "very comprehensive legislative job" unlikely to draw much opposition.

But gun enthusiasts probably will take a much different attitude toward three tougher bills, introduced last week by California legislators for regard the compromise package as too lenient. One bill would let local law authorities give pistol-carrying permits only to residents of their own jurisdiction. As things stand now, lawmen complain, a man whose background is such that his own police chief won't grant him a pistol permit can get one in another town where he isn't known.

At the heart of the fight against many restrictions on guns is the National Rifle Association, whose 670,000 members usually also belong to affiliated State and local groups. The NRA isn't registered as an official lobbying body, but still gets its message across effectively through letters members write to legislators on key committees.

There are two main lines of argument against gun control laws. For one thing, gun groups contend that stringent regulations make it difficult for citizens to own and use guns to protect themselves against criminals. They also argue that requiring all gun owners to register would make it that much easier for a foreign power or domestic revolutionaries to disarm loyal American citizens.

MILITARY PAY RAISE

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the conscience of this Nation would be shocked if it learned that while promoting a war against poverty, the Federal Government itself continues to promote poverty. This it is doing by underpaying thousands in its employment.

Like most Americans who are too busily involved in their own bailiwick to note the injustice which we impose upon a dedicated segment of our citizenry, I have been shocked out of my lethargy by a series of newspaper and magazine articles to speak out and make every effort to do something about correcting an inexcusable situation. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the shabby treatment we accord fellow citizens of our military forces. They are the forgotten segment of our population, perhaps because they are without unions or lobbyists. We certainly do not expect a civilian employed on a full-time basis, on call 24 hours a day, to work for anything less than a living wage. Why then should we expect our men in uniform who are the first to be asked to risk their lives in defense of our American way of life, including our standard of living, to work for anything less than a living wage? It is almost unbelievable and no doubt shocking to the average American that an enlisted man in grade 1 (lowest rank) is paid only $78 a month in his first 4 months of duty and then only $83.20 for the following 20 months that he is in the service.

No one expects a man to provide for a family of four on a monthly salary of $167.10; but, curiously enough if a man is in military uniform we expect him to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I am continually amazed at the number of our career personnel in the Armed Forces, who with firm dedication and a great deal of sacrifice to themselves and their families, accept the lot of the underpaid and give unselfishly of themselves to the service of their country. They are dedicated men whom we ought to make every effort to reward rather than neglect. It is no secret that the heart of our uniformed services is the educated, trained, and highly professional man, whether enlisted or commissioned. Unless these men make a commitment to a professional career in our Armed Forces, the American people have much to lose, both in money and human resources. It is more than mere speculation to say that we are losing the kind of men I am talking about by the thousands each year. The U.S. Navy League recently published the results of a study of manpower and pay which are, quite frankly, alarming.

The league pointed out that the Navy alone loses 130,000 enlisted personnel each year and about 10,000 officers. No small amount of these men are highly competent professionals, whose skills must be replaced at a huge cost to the American people.

As it has been so eloquently stated by our able chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: "We may develop the most exotic weapons systems in the world; we may build the finest missiles; we may construct fantastic underwater missile launchers; we may lead the world in equipment, but if we do not have men and women provided with a standard of living equivalent to the standard of living they are defending, then one of these days we will awaken to the sad realization that our Armed Forces are sadly deficient in two indispensable ingredients—leadership and motivation."

I propose that we seriously consider raising the salaries of the lower grades, in both the enlisted and officer ranks, by as much as 50 percent, and increasing allowances for dependents at all grade levels, to the extent that our men in uniform may be able to look forward to providing his family with a decent living and his children with a college education.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, for centuries the Byelorussian people were almost lost in the huge czarist empire of Russia, and peoples in the rest of the world were hardly aware of Byelorussians as a distinct ethnic group. Then toward the end of World War I when these 10 million Byelorussians asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence of Russia, all peoples becam(very much aware of this historic fact.

On March 25, 1918, when the czarist regime was shattered, Byelorussians formed their own independent state in their historic homeland, with its capital at Minsk. At once they set out to rebuild their new state in the image of their centuries-old dream, and in freedom they were doing their utmost to attain their goal. But all their efforts were of no avail, and all their hopes were dashed by the aggressive Red army. Before the end of 1918 Byelorussia was attacked, overrun, and then made part of the Soviet Union.

Thus ended the brief but glorious period of independence in Byelorussia. Today for more than 45 years the Byelorussian people have been prisoners in their homeland, effectively sealed off from the free world by hundreds of miles behind the Iron Curtain. But they have not given up their hope for freedom and are praying for the day of their deliverance from Communist tyranny. On the 47th anniversary of their independence, Mr. President, we join them in their prayers.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FREIDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the anniversary of Byelorussian independence. This is a day upon which we of the free world pay tribute to a people who have long suffered from the deprivation of liberty. It is also a day upon which we rededicate ourselves to the principles of universal freedom.

It would be easy for Americans to lapse into a mood of passive acquiescence on this question of loss of liberty. But this we have never done. Our own institutions are by no means perfect; nor have they ever been perfect. They are, after all, only the creations of man with all his weaknesses and shortcomings. Ours is a system of perfecting democracy in which we seek ultimately the idealistic goal established by our Founding Fathers, the goal of universal freedom.

In one sense ours is a privileged nation for the fact remains that we as a nation have never suffered the total loss of freedom. Thus, we cannot really know the pains and anguish of enslavement; we cannot really know the misfortune that has befallen those heroic Byelorussian peoples who, after a momentary respite of freedom, have again been brought under the tyranny of the Russian state.

For all the benefits we have enjoyed, still we as a people have been on the firing line of freedom so many times in our brief history that I feel sure we need not experience the loss of freedom to know its real value. Even at this very moment our American men are in Vietnam fighting for the ideals of human liberty. These ideals have always inspired our Nation to great sacrifice and I believe they will always do so.

In commemorating the national independence of Byelorussia as we are doing today, it is fitting to pay tribute to those who have lost their freedom, but it is also fitting to call the attention of the world to our own commitment to the cause of freedom. In so doing, we reaffirm our own commitment and in our reaffirmation we revitalize that glorious ideal to which we hope and pray all mankind aspires, the ideal of universal freedom. This act of rededication gives heart to the downtrodden; it gives them hope for the future that one day they, too, may enjoy the blessings of liberty and have within their own power the right to determine for themselves their nation's destiny.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently I received from the secretary of the Senate of Pennsylvania and from the chief clerk of the house of representatives in Harrisburg copies of two resolutions which were introduced in those respective bodies.

These resolutions were of consequential interest to me, and I felt that they might be of interest to the other Members of this Congress as well.

They are as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The closing of the Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown, Pa., will add to the unemployed of central Pennsylvania about one-fourth of the total to be made unemployed by the recent order of Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, closing certain installations throughout the United States. About 12,000 families will be seriously affected by the order.

In addition to the economic suffering of the unemployed the Commonwealth and the political subdivisions of the area will be adversely affected by the resultant additions of poverty-stricken families to relief rolls, etc., and the economy of central Pennsylvania will grind to a low point in the years to come because of the loss of the annual $73 million payroll of the base.

National defense expenditures in Pennsylvania constitute only one-third of the amount spent in New York and only one-eighth of that spent in California. The phasing out of the Olmsted Base will lower the share of the Commonwealth to less than 3½ cents of each national defense dollar.

Olmsted Air Force Base is the only base operated by the Air Force in Pennsylvania. Its closing may result in inadequate protection for Pennsylvania and Northeastern United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara be urged to rescind the order directing the phasing out of the Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

Attest:

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

This is a Nation of immigrants in which citizens of many cultures and ethnic origins live and work side by side to make the American ideal of equality for all men a reality.

Immigrants represent less than 0.25 percent of the total work force. Those entering the labor force have talents and skills which are in short supply in our economy: Therefore be it

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

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

FREE TRADE

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress grinds out much needed legislation to relieve distress, discomfort, need, and want in our Nation we should listen once in a while at least to those among us who have sobering thoughts on the state of our Nation.

Recently, a copy of a letter came into my possession and I was impressed with the seriousness and sincerity of the writer's observations.

Whether we agree or disagree with his premise on free trade we must admit that his logic, for the industry he represents, has merit.

For the past several years I have predicted the impending gold crisis based upon the same logic as contained in this letter and the records of our trade balances. While it is an exercise in futility to try to change the course of the river of free trade thinking at this point it might not be so futile if we could start looking for the answers, for the future.

We have started a serious and disastrous philosophy of profit over any other consideration in our trade policy.

The case of Studebaker is one in point. I will bet my last dime that we will soon lose the bulk of our parts industry not alone to Canada but to U.S.-owned foreign site facilities.

This is as sure as a new day tomorrow.

The letter follows:

IMPERIAL GLASS CORP.,
Bellaire, Ohio, January 15, 1965.

Mr. JACK MCDERMOTT,
Editor, Gift & Tableware Reporter,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR JACK: Thanks for the invitation to write you a letter re my philosophy on free trade for your publication. I respectfully decline. It would accomplish nothing. This I've learned over the past 30 years, the hard way.

The retailer cares not about such philosophy or reasoning. His desire is to buy at the best possible price and to sell at a profit. He cares nothing about source; excepting S. & H., about the lone, sterling and worthwhile exception that proves my allegation.

He cares not to listen to the story of tariff duties once being our Nation's prime source of revenue, and that now he himself and American manufacturers are paying huge annual taxes to replace those no-longer-existing duties and yes, to even provide the capital investment necessary to produce the plant facilities for the foreign production.

He's not at all interested in the historical fact that on this continent there first existed and still exists the only truly free trade in the entire world—interstate trade. And that it is fair trade too, because wages and taxes and transportation are fairly equal and seldom subsidized.

The retailer is too busy to note the true impact of the statement that 93 percent of the fine china sold in America in 1964 was foreign-made. He's only concerned with the fact that it made him a profit.

He's not a bit distressed that jobs were lost at Imperial last year when counterfeit, low-priced candlewick arrived from Japan and Czechoslovakia. He bought it.

Nor is he concerned that at the recent Atlantic City show Toscany presented a copy of our pressed scroll stemware from Italy, for sale at about 50 percent off our closely-marked suggested list price. The fact that his purchase of this low-cost, nigh duty free copy will cost American workmen jobs does not register as he buys it. All that he registers is the sound of his cash register.

He does not care at all that as imports increase because they are tax free, his own business and personal taxes increase to make free trade still freer. In fact he often sees to it that importers do actual harm to domestic producers. He's utterly blind to the economic truth that today's importation is a tapeworm living off American taxes, and that he cannot escape paying his full share of this cost.

Nor do the journals of our trade find this whole matter, or even small segments of it, worthy of mention, and for obvious reasons. They too are managed press—policies directed by the majority of their advertisers.

As I sit before my open fire tonight, dictating this letter to you, I'm not unmindful that I recently talked, after much correspondence, with one from a country over the sea who frankly told me he was interested in buying all our equipment and shipping it to his "home nation" where it would all be employed to produce glass for export back here and that such a cash purchase could be made because of American Government money available to him through his country.

This is of no interest to your retailers (and none of their business). Even though it would increase their taxes, and yours, neither of you would be bothered, nor would our Congress be concerned for they, in their infinite wisdom, would provide—but at whose cost? Tax-supported Appalachia would just be extended to include another community.

The chip has been long-gone if it ever was on my shoulder re this subject. I've turned to prayer and away from logic. Thinking and reason is distasteful in the Great Society and sophistication reigns instead, which word I was taught to mean complex, not clarity. I only want a fair break. I do not want my taxes used to provide and support tax-free competition against me. When it comes to free trade, I'd like some of it too. I've been unable to change just for the sake of change. I'm too old a dog, I reckon. Goodnight.

Confidentially,

CARL GUSTKEY,
President.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, until World War II Byelorussians were among

the least known of the many peoples living under the yoke of Soviet communism. We had heard of the Ukrainians, the Baltic peoples, of peoples in the Caucasus, and even of those in distant Asiatic areas, but one seldom heard of the Byelorussians despite the fact that as an ethnic group they are more numerous than any of the groups named above. As a matter of fact these 10 million Byelorussians constitute the third largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union, exceeded only by the Russians and the Ukrainians. And these people, with their past glory, had lived there in the area east of the Baltic Sea, north of the Black Sea in northeastern Europe through the Middle Ages. Early in modern times their country was annexed to Russia and so remained until they regained their freedom in 1918.

These Slavic but distinctly different ethnic people managed to retain their national traits and traditions, and succeeded in keeping alive their national sentiments while subjected to Russia's czarist regime. Finally, when the czarist regime was no more, Byelorussians felt free and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918. Soon they set up their own government and were masters of their own destiny for a very brief period. Within less than a year, however, the Red army overran the country, and independent Byelorussia ceased to exist. All freedom vanished from Byelorussia, but the vivid and joyous experience of that brief period still lives in the hearts and minds of the Byelorussian people.

For more than 45 years these people have been suffering under Communist domination in their homeland. But they have found it hard to reconcile their lot with the ways of oppressive communism. Neither those who endure the Communist regime there, nor those Byelorussians living abroad, have recognized the Soviet rule over their homeland. Americans of Byelorussian descent detest and despise both the regime in the land of their ancestors and those who rule there. On the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day we all join these people in this observance and express the hope that soon Byelorussians shall be free from Communist domination in their homeland.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 47th anniversary of the attempt of the Byelorussian people to make themselves independent, the goal of all men proud of their distinctive cultural, historical, and linguistic heritage.

The endless series of autocratic regimes centered in Moscow has never been willing to tolerate diversity. They have spared no amount of effort and no amount of blood to force different nationality groups into a common mold without the opportunity of self-government, and deprived of the most fundamental civil rights.

The collapse of the corrupt and ineffective czarist regime during the First World War gave many of the subjugated nationalities the chance they had longed for to establish themselves as free and independent nations, threatening no one, desiring only to live their own lives in peace.

The people of Byelorussia boldly and courageously seized this opportunity to proclaim themselves an independent republic after 3 years of German wartime occupation had come to an end.

But even though the faces had changed in the Kremlin, and the ideological justification for tyranny had shifted from the discredited notion of divine right of kings to the corrupt notion of all power to the party, these two regimes had one thing in common: they were determined to wipe out all traces of national identity and independence.

The first onslaught of the newly formed Red army came a year after Byelorussian independence has been proclaimed, and in 1921, the territory of the Byelorussian people was divided between the Soviet Union and Poland.

A similar pattern took place in the Second World War. There was a period of German occupation followed by the renewal of Moscow domination through the instrument of the Red army. Only this time the whole of the territory was swallowed up and Poland also became a puppet satellite.

Now that the rulers in Moscow have proclaimed their intolerance of all independence and national identity everywhere in the world, the peoples in the free world have become part of the struggle that, on a smaller scale, was waged by the Byelorussian people 47 years ago. Let us look upon that time as the beginning, not the end, of man's irresistible movement toward the goal of freedom for all peoples.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the world will always be indebted to the Greeks for their contributions in all fields of human learning, in the arts and the sciences. Centuries before our era Greeks were formulating political ideas and ideals which became the foundation of our modern democratic political institutions. In this, as we all know, the Greeks were pioneers without rivals or equals. In the sciences they broke new ground and in a sense paved the way for modern scientific miracles.

Unfortunately, however, with all their learning and genius for understanding, the Greeks proved incapable of adequately defending their political institutions and were conquered by less gifted but more powerfully organized peoples. The last of these peoples were the Ottoman Turks who overran Greece more than 500 years ago and made Greece a province of the Ottoman Empire for some 400 years. But the Greeks managed to preserve the spirit of freedom and individual worth. They yearned for their independence, and 144 years ago they set out to attain it.

On March 25, 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised a new national emblem over his monastery at Kalavryta, signaling the Greek revolt against the Turks. Thus began long years of struggle to establish a new and free Greek nation. Though fighting against overwhelming odds, the Greeks were united in their uncompromising determination and love of liberty. They won the admiration of other free nations, and had their wholehearted sympathy, including that of the United States. We watched anxiously their fight, were overjoyed by their eventual victory, and then witnessed the newly independent nation grow from infancy to maturity in the course of more than 100 years.

This country has always taken keen interest in the well-being and safety of Greece, and we have done our very best to aid her in many ways. And we have found that our confidence was not misplaced, and our aid was not wasted, for today in free, democratic, and independent Greece we have one of our stanchest allies in our struggle against the Communist world. On the 144th anniversary of Greek independence, Mr. Speaker, I wish the Greek people peace and prosperity.

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, marks the 144th anniversary of Greek independence. It was on March 25, 1821, that the first European echo of the American Revolution was heard on the European Continent. On that day, 144 years ago, a band of dedicated freedom-loving Greek patriots raised a flag of liberty and swore that they would have freedom or die in the attempt. It was not the first time that the gallant remnants of the brave Greek nation had risen against foreign domination. For more than 4 centuries of alien domination, they had fought for liberty regularly, on an average every 11 years. Each of those attempts was drowned in blood and destruction.

But the 1821 rising was destined to succeed. Fighting against incredible odds, accepting stoically the price not only in blood but in property that the

alien rulers exacted, the Greeks fought on amid their smoldering homes and burning orchards—for the trees, too, were destroyed to quench the spirit of liberty—and 8 long years later they won, as the Americans had won earlier, thus affirming for the first time in Europe the right of nations to rule themselves.

Today, too, Mr. Speaker, the Greek Cypriots on the island of Cyprus are again demonstrating that indomitable spirit for justice and the dignity of man.

On this 144th anniversary of Greek independence my hope is that all America will pause to pay tribute to these heroic people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Greek publication, the Chicago PNYX, be included in the RECORD.

This article in this great paper which I received from Peter N. Mantzoros, editor, very eloquently describes the occasion of this heroic anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, the article is as follows:

TWENTY-FIFTH OF MARCH 1965, 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

March 25, 1821, marks the first European echo of the American Revolution. On that date, 144 years ago, a band of dedicated freedom-loving Greek patriots raised a flag of liberty and swore that they would have freedom or die in the attempt. It was not the first time that the gallant remnants of the brave Greek nation had risen against foreign domination. For more than four centuries of alien domination, they had fought for liberty regularly, on an average every 11 years. Each of those attempts was drowned in blood and destruction.

But the 1821 rising was destined to succeed. Fighting against incredible odds, accepting stoically the price not only in blood but in property that the alien rulers exacted, the Greeks fought on amid their smouldering homes and burning orchards—for the trees, too, were destroyed to quench the spirit of liberty—and 8 long years later they won, as the Americans had won earlier, thus affirming for the first time in Europe the right of nations to rule themselves.

They found scant support from other European governments at first, those brave Greek fighters. The great capitals of Europe were more concerned with the balance of power and with supporting Turkey, whom they called then the sick man of Europe, rather than allowing the Greek subjects of the Turk to gain freedom.

But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed. The example of the American Revolution had sown seeds that had grown deep roots. Freedom lovers from other nations came to offer their lives in the cause of Greek liberty. Greeks are proud that Americans participated in that noble endeavor.

In 1821, when the Greeks rose against the Turkish Empire to throw off the yoke of nearly 450 years, to the average American Greece was either a remote country, somewhere in Europe, or an ancient civilization, famous for its books and buildings. Soon, however, Greece became a real and immediate entity. The Greek struggle for freedom stirred the American press, aroused American orators and stimulated the neoclassic trends in American art, literature, and architecture. American opinion was unanimous. A people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy, a nation fighting for its liberty, should be free.

The first American to sponsor the cause of Greek liberty was Edward Everett, professor of Greek at Harvard University. A man of strong convictions, Everett was determined not only to make speeches for Greece, but to act. In the name of Greece he initiated a crusade against the reactionary and oppressive policy of the Holy Alliance in Europe.

His efforts for Greek independence were to bear fruit, and a year later popular feeling was officially reflected in President Monroe's annual message to Congress, which declared: "Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their [the Greeks'] contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

The Greeks, on their side, looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in May 1821, was the delivery of an address to the American people, beginning: "Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode * * *. Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue."

Soon interest in Greece spread beyond Everett's campus at Harvard. Throughout the 1820's, students in American public schools, colleges, and universities were holding meetings, passing resolutions, and writing expressions of support for the Greek cause.

The youth of America at that time was keenly interested in the struggle for human freedom which it saw going on in Greece. Some young men volunteered in the Greek armed forces. Young George Jarvis, Jonathan Miller, and Samuel Gridley Howe distinguished themselves on the Greek battlefields. Their own American Revolution was only a few decades past; the interim years had seen the writing of the American Constitution and the careful construction of a republic on the foundations of freedom. Theirs was not merely a passive interest in what was happening in Greece; they felt that their own ideas and lives were involved, and, over a hundred years ago, they felt America could not remain isolated.

Eventually, the heroic sacrifices of the Greeks could no longer be ignored. Public opinion in the civilized world was revolted by the brutal suffering of a small heroic nation that was obviously determined to die fighting rather than live in bondage and the great European powers swung their weight behind the Greeks who, at last, obtained for themselves the benefits of freedom, an idea that they gave to the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, nearly all peoples everywhere celebrate their independence day, and to each it has its special significance. Some observe and celebrate to mark once more a turning point in their national history; others do so in a perfunctory manner, as if such days were like other holidays, marked on the calendars and so to be observed. Still others celebrate their independence days in solemn ceremonies even though their independence is unfortunately nothing more than a mere memory. But the Greek Independence Day is of immense significance both to the Greeks and to all others who are aware of their inestimable debt to the Greek genius.

To the Greek people its significance lies in the fact that after their forebears had given birth to the idea of freedom and democracy, and had practiced and enjoyed the blessings of the fullest freedom in their homeland, and then had lost it nearly 2,000 years ago, the Greek people were able to regain their freedom early in the 19th century. Its larger significance is that nothing has pleased the citizens of the free world more than to see these descendants of gifted Greeks attain their freedom. That is why the free world, especially the West, has been something of a guardian angel of the modern Greek state for nearly a century and a half.

World-rocking events have transformed much of the Grecian world since 1821, when the Greek struggle to throw off the Ottoman yoke began. Conquerors and invaders have come and gone, but the original Greek ideal of freedom has remained as one imperishable hallmark of freemen. It is just as highly prized today as when it was conceived and developed by the Greek genius, although some free people act somewhat unaware of its immense influence on us. In this we are deeply indebted to the Greeks as the fountainhead of such an inspiration for us all. Conscious of our obligation to the Greeks, we naturally would do our best to reciprocate in some way, and this we, Americans in particular, have done on many occasions.

The Greek state grew up and took its place in the community of sovereign nations, and we as well as other friends of Greece everywhere did our utmost to help the small but dynamic state gather strength and attain full maturity. And when in time of trouble Greece was under serious threat, even in danger of losing its very independence, we did not sit by and watch it be devoured by its foes. On more than one occasion, I am happy to say, we were instrumental in saving Greece from threatening dangers and chaos. At the end of the First World War our financial aid was decisive in saving Greece from bankruptcy. At the end of the last, when this cradle of freedom was in mortal danger of being engulfed in a Communist chaos, we did not hesitate to lend sufficient aid to save Greece from communism. And today we can take just pride in what we did. In our relentless struggle against tyrannical communism the Greeks are our loyal allies and firm friends. On the 144th anniversary of Greek independence, let us hope and pray for peace and prosperity, for power and fortitude, for the Greeks in their continuing determination to protect their hard-won independence and to help defend the frontiers of freedom.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, 144 years ago, the Greek people launched a struggle to regain their liberty from the Ottoman Turks. On the anniversary of this occasion it is only appropriate that we reflect on the sources of friendship between the people of Greece and the people of the United States, and that we express our hope that the ties binding our two nations will remain as strong in the future as they have been in the past. We cannot overlook how deeply the practice of democracy in our country has been marked by the experience and traditions of ancient Greece. We and other peoples of East and West have been nourished

for centuries by the legacy of the poets, philosophers, and dramatists of ancient Greece. Nor can we forget how deeply the American people were stirred by the Greek struggle for independence in the early 19th century. American leaders consistently expressed their support for the Greek cause through the years while the struggle was being waged. Some Americans volunteered to fight with the Greeks; Americans in many communities organized groups to send aid to the Greeks. More recently, following World War II, the Greeks had to renew their struggle for independence. The Ottoman Turks were replaced by threatening Communist armies both within and without. This time also, Americans felt a surge of sympathy for the threatened Greeks. Following the proclamation of the Truman doctrine in 1947, massive economic and military aid was sent to Greece. Without the determination of the Greek people to safeguard their independence, however, this aid would have been insignificant. Today the Greek Government is strong and stable, and the Greek economy is experiencing rapid growth. Moreover, Greece, as a member of NATO is making a significant contribution to the defense forces of the West. On the occasion of the 144th anniversary of the Greek struggle for independence, it is a pleasure to express my admiration for the spirited, confident, and courageous people of Greece.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on this 144th anniversary of Greek independence we once more acknowledge our immense debt to the Greek genius. These immortal creators of ideas and ideals were among the first lovers of freedom and were the first to evolve effective democratic institutions. Their thought was so profound and practical that no people before their time, and probably none since, has achieved the luster of their civilization. And the democratic ideas and ideals which they developed benefited not themselves alone, but all mankind. These ideals, as we realize today, are timeless and universal. That is the most valuable contribution of the Greeks to our own civilization.

It is sad, but true, that such gifted and gallant people, matchless masters in evolving great institutions, proved too disunited to preserve these institutions when faced with powerful foes. So almost 2,000 years ago the Greeks lost their freedom and were subjected to alien regimes in their homeland. One empire after another held them down for more than 1,000 years, and then came the Ottoman Turks. They made Greece a province of their empire and ruled over the Greek people with an iron hand. But the Greeks were not lost in this huge empire; they kept up their centuries-old ideals of freedom and independence and looked for the first opportunity to reestablish them.

On the 25th of March 1821, they unfurled the banner of revolt against the Turks, and for 6 years they fought their more powerful foes as their ancestors had fought against the more powerful Persian invaders of Greece. At times the issue seemed in doubt, and many friends of the Greek people abroad feared that the Greek cause would be lost unless effective and immediate aid was rushed to them. Happily such aid was provided in the form of Britain's navy, which in one pitched battle at Navarino in October of 1827 annihilated the Ottoman fleet, thereby assuring the freedom and independence of Greece.

We in this great Republic are deeply indebted to many people for their contributions to our way of life. But over all and above all, Mr. Speaker, we owe a great and inestimable debt of gratitude to the Greek genius. For that and for many other reasons I am proud to participate in this observance of the 144th anniversary observance of Greek independence.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the calendar of history marks Friday as the anniversary of a famous event in man's struggle for freedom and self-government—the 144th anniversary of Greek independence.

After more than 450 years of foreign domination and countless earlier uprisings, the long rule of the Turkish Empire was broken.

One of the first American sponsors of the Greek cause was Edward Everett, Harvard University professor of Greek, who initiated a crusade in the name of Greece against the oppressive policy of the Holy Alliance in Europe. From Professor Everett came the start of America's support of Greece's struggle for freedom. Six years before the outbreak he discussed conditions in Greece in his master of arts oration. Interest soon spread to other colleges and universities where meetings and resolutions expressed support for the Greek cause.

Sympathy for the Greek struggle was aroused by the press in America. Among the Americans who went to the aid of the Greeks and participated in their bid for freedom were three who distinguished themselves on Greek battlefields—George Jarvis, Jonathan Miller, and Samuel Gridley Howe.

Professor Everett's efforts for Greek independence were rewarded later when President Monroe's annual message to Congress declared:

> Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States.

One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in May 1821, was the delivery of an address to the American people which began:

> Friends, fellow citizens and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode.

In the same spirit of liberty that had sparked the fight for self-rule earlier on American soil, the struggle and sacrifices which began on Greek soil in 1821 brought for that small heroic nation the benefits of freedom born of an idea their own ancesters had given to the world. The justice of their cause—that freedom and democratic ideas expounded by ancient Greek philosophers should thrive on Greek soil—well warranted the sympathy offered by the American people at the time of the struggle, and well warrants the tribute we pay it here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent a number of distinguished citizens of Greek ancestry in Michigan's Second District. I also represent a city named soon after that revolution to honor one of its great patriots, the city of Ypsilanti, Mich. I wish to join with them today in paying tribute to the Greek Republic.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a communication from the Royal Greek Embassy, on Massachusetts Avenue NW., in Washington, D.C., regarding the 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day, which falls on March 25. This statement is so interesting, and the facts it deals with are so significant that I am pleased to include the text of the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

> March 25, 1821, marks the first European echo of the American Revolution. On that date, 144 years ago, a band of dedicated freedom-loving Greek patriots raised a flag of liberty and swore that they would have freedom or die in the attempt. It was not the first time that the gallant remnants of the brave Greek nation had risen against foreign domination. For more than four centuries of alien domination, they had fought for liberty regularly, on an average every 11 years. Each of those attempts was drowned in blood and destruction.
>
> But the 1821 rising was destined to succeed. Fighting against incredible odds, accepting stoically the price not only in blood but in property that the alien rulers exacted, the Greeks fought on amid their smoldering homes and burning orchards—for the trees, too, were destroyed to quench the spirit of liberty—and 8 long years later they won, as the Americans had won earlier, thus affirming for the first time in Europe the right of nations to rule themselves.
>
> They found scant support from other European governments at first, those brave Greek fighters. The great capitals of Europe were more concerned with the balance of power and with supporting Turkey, whom they called then the sick man of Europe, rather than allowing the Greek subjects of the Turk to gain freedom.
>
> But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed. The example of the American Revolution had sown seeds that had grown deep roots. Freedom lovers from other nations came to offer their lives in the cause of Greek liberty. Greeks are proud that Americans participated in that noble endeavor.
>
> In 1821, when the Greeks rose against the Turkish Empire to throw off a yoke of nearly 450 years, to the average American Greece was either a remote country, somewhere in Europe, or an ancient civilization, famous for its books and buildings. Soon, however, Greece became a real and immediate entity. The Greek struggle for freedom stirred the American press, aroused American orators and stimulated the neoclassic trends in American art, literature, and architecture. American opinion was unanimous: a people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy, a nation fighting for its liberty, should be free.
>
> The first American to sponsor the cause of Greek liberty was Edward Everett, professor of Greek at Harvard University. A man of strong convictions, Everett was determined not only to make speeches for Greece, but to act. In the name of Greece he initiated a crusade against the reactionary and oppressive policy of the holy alliance in Europe.

His efforts for Greek independence were to bear fruit, and a year later popular feeling was officially reflected in President Monroe's annual message to Congress, which declared: "Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their (the Greeks') contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

The Greeks, on their side, looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in May 1821 was the delivery of an address to the American people, beginning: "Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode. * * * Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue."

It was natural for the American institutions of higher learning to take the lead in aiding the Greek cause; there intellectual freedom was upheld as the cardinal aim in education, and youthful enthusiasm for justice and liberty ran high. From Harvard University came the signal for America's support of Greek freedom. It was given by Edward Everett 6 years before the outbreak of the Greek Revolution, in his oration for the degree of master of arts in 1814, which he called "The Restoration of Greece." It contained many prophetic notes. Judging by later reports, his listeners were carried away by the eloquence with which he pleaded for an independent Greece. After graduation from Harvard, Everett visited Hellas on the eve of its independence. He wrote an engaging account of his experiences in Greece during 1818 and 1819 which unfortunately has never been published.

It was Everett who guided Daniel Webster in his famous address on Greece, delivered before the American Congress.

Soon interest in Greece spread beyond Everett's campus at Harvard. Throughout the 1820's, students in American public schools, colleges, and universities were holding meetings, passing resolutions, and writing expressions of support for the Greek cause.

The youth of America at that time was keenly interested in the struggle for human freedom which it saw going on in Greece. Some young men volunteered in the Greek armed forces. Young George Jarvis, Jonathan Miller, and Samuel Gridley Howe distinguished themselves on the Greek battlefields. Their own American Revolution was only a few decades past; the interim years had seen the writing of the American Constitution and the careful construction of a republic on the foundations of freedom. Theirs was not merely a passive interest in what was happening in Greece; they felt that their own ideals and lives were involved, and, over a hundred years ago, they felt America could not remain isolated.

Eventually, the heroic sacrifices of the Greeks could no longer be ignored. Public opinion in the civilized world was revolted by the brutal suffering of a small heroic nation that was obviously determined to die fighting rather than live in bondage and the great European powers swung their weight behind the Greeks who, at last, obtained for themselves the benefits of freedom, an idea that they gave to the world.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the face of Greece, as Nikos Kazantzakis said, bears 12 successive inscriptions: Contemporary, the period of 1821, the Turkish yoke, the Frankish sway, the Byzantine, the Roman, the Hellenistic epoch, the classic, the Dorian middle ages, the Mycenaean, the Aegean, and the Stone Age.

Most Americans are familiar mainly with the classic and the contemporary faces of Greece.

We have been conscious of Greece's tenacity in World War II when, in defeating Mussolini in Albania, it became the first nation to turn back the Fascists. We followed Greece's grudging retreat before the German armies, winced at its painful restoration amid civil war in the late 1940's, smiled at its flowering into a strong two-party democracy in the 1950's and 1960's. And we are hopeful it will measure up to its responsibilities in the tension-filled Cyprus crisis of today.

There is a new interest in contemporary Greece. It is engendered by Greece's great lure for tourists, for it combines antiquity with wonderful climate and hospitable people. Interest is heightened by an increasing Greek contribution to 20th-century culture. I think of Mitropoulos and Callas and Hadjidakis in music, Kazan and Cocoyannis, Mercouri and Cassavetes in the theater and cinema, Kazantzakis and Seferis in literature, Doxiadis in city planning. There are hundreds more, thousands more, not as well known, but destined to contribute greatly.

All civilized men and women owe something to the golden age of Greece. It is axiomatic that Western civilization had its beginnings there.

In this regard, modern Greek wits have for years been saying "We gave lights to the world but forget to keep some for ourselves." If this was ever true, it is being corrected in Greece today.

There is underway a new flowering of Greek thought and achievement. It would be too much to hope for another golden age, but I expect men and women of Greek blood to contribute much to world knowledge in the decades ahead. Education is becoming universal in Greece today—and this will bear fruit. Moreover, the offspring of Greek immigrants have reached maturity in the English-speaking nations, and we have already seen significant contributions here, and we can look for more.

Why do I mention the English-speaking nations? A wise old coffeehouse philosopher in Detroit once pointed out that only in English-speaking lands do Greek immigrants succeed in large numbers. I think this point is well taken. Greek energies and minds have found fertile soil in the United States, England, and Australia.

The contemporary achievements of the Greeks find inspiration in the deeds of ancient Greece. Because they are descendants of great predecessors, many happily feel a duty to think great thoughts and perform great deeds.

Kazantzakis writes in his "Journey to the Morea":

Walk through Corinth, Argos, Olympia, Megalopolis, and Sparta, and an unexpected responsibility weighs on your shoulders; on the shoulders of all the living Greeks around you. The names have a strange and irresistible power—whoever is born in Greece, whether or not he wishes, undertakes great responsibilities.

The successes, the opportunities, and the hopes of contemporary Greece were made possible by the war of independence of 1821. Peloponnesus, Athens and environs, and many of the Aegean islands were freed after 400 years of Turkish occupation.

Greek Independence Day marks the 144th anniversary of that day, March 25, 1821, when Archbishop Germanos of Patras, raised the banner of freedom at Kalavryta. In an interesting parallel of history, another man of Patras, Prime Minister George Papandreou defends the banner of freedom in modern Athens.

The fever of patriotism burned in the Greek breast in 1821, and it has so burned in generations thereafter. The Greek idea, that is, the recapture of the unredeemed lands—Crete, the islands, Thessaly, Epirus, Thrace, and Macedonia, was riveted in the minds of Greeks from childhood. This was the great motivation which saw 50,000 Greek immigrants in America, in a remarkable but little-known chapter of history, return to Greece in 1912–13 to fight in the Balkan wars. This hardy band paid their own passage across the Atlantic, clothed themselves, fought without financial reward, and saw large numbers of their comrades killed. They helped return northern Greece to Greek hands.

Of the 50,000, many returned to the United States, raised families, and became solid citizens of America. Now in their seventies and eighties, these men do not see their numbers replenished from abroad. Only a trickle of Greek immigrants come to American soil, for the Greek quota is a tiny 308 a year.

The Greek fighting spirit overcame heavy odds against Mussolini's army in 1940, throwing it back into Albania. And this same spirit delayed, perhaps fatally, the German timetable in Russia in 1941, by inflicting unexpected damage on the German invaders in Greece. And we know that the Greek expeditionary forces performed admirably in Korea in 1950–53.

It has been estimated that there are over a million Americans of Greek descent. Invariably, they are good family people, law abiding, and industrious. Over 40,000 reside in Metropolitan Detroit. I know they are proud to be Americans, and proud to form part of the historic bond which has existed between Greece and America.

The U.S. Congress is the epitome of democracy—a Greek idea. In this Capital City, indeed in the construction of the Capitol itself, we honor Greek architecture. The Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials are, in a sense, Greek. And so, the ancient Hellenes beautify our city physically as they enrich us politically and spiritually.

The ancients of Greece are the ancestors of all the Western World. On this anniversary of Greek Independence Day, I am pleased to pay tribute to the ancients and to their direct descendants. Long may they prosper.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, 144 years ago today, the heirs to the civilization of ancient Greece, proclaimed their

independence and took their rightful place among the democracies of the world. Today, we salute this brave nation on the anniversary of their independence.

Greek independence was achieved after four centuries of alien domination, during which the valiant Greek people fought for their independence on an average of once every 11 years. Despite the losses and frustrations suffered in these attempts, the fire of liberty was not extinguished by the blood they shed. Finally, on March 25, 1821, their efforts were crowned with success.

Although other European nations gave little support to the democratic nation which was created, here in the United States, support for their cause was found. It grew quickly as the North American Nation which had fought for and secured its own liberty, wholeheartedly determined that a people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy should be free.

As President Monroe told the Congress:

> Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States.

For its part, the new Greek nation looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. In May 1821, the first Greek Senate addressed the American people, saying:

> Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode * * *. Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue.

In the years since 1821, admiration has continued to flow in both directions between Greece and the United States. The tribulations the Greek nation withstood during the Second World War and the troubles which beset that country after the war ended aroused Americans to not only sympathize, but to actively help their Greek "friends, fellow citizens, and brothers" remain free.

The contributions made and still being made to the growth of the United States by the Greeks who have chosen to make their homes here continue to cement the feelings we have for Greece, and on this anniversary of their independence, we salute them.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Greek people who today commemorate their victorious struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire.

This Greek Independence Day serves to remind us, too, of the invaluable legacy these gifted people have bestowed upon the world: architecture, sculpture, philosophy, and politics, of course, come quickly to mind. But we in the Congress are particularly aware of the experiments in democratic government carried on at Athens 2,000 years ago which inspired our Founding Fathers in fashioning our own democracy.

On this 144th anniversary of their independence we all wish peace and prosperity to the valiant and talented Greeks, our friends in peace and war.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of the 144th anniversary of the day on which the Greek people declared their determination to once again become a free people after centuries of foreign domination is a great occasion in the history of mankind. March 25, 1965, provides us with the opportunity to recall the manifold contributions of Greece to Western civilization, and the awakening of modern interest in the fate of the Greek people as a result of their resolve to once again become an independent nation, announced to an unconcerned world nearly 1½ centuries ago.

It has become axiomatic to say that we owe a great debt to the civilization which flourished in Greece in the millenium before the birth of Christ. Yet how many of us are actually aware of the extent and depth of this contribution? It is to Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, and other playwrights that we owe the birth of drama as we know it. It is to Euclid, Archimedes, Hipparchus, Hippocrates, Aristotle, and others that we owe the birth of the sciences which have so changed the face of the world we live in. And, it is to innumerable painters, sculptors, and architects that we owe the esthetic foundations of many of our arts. Actually, it would be impossible to acknowledge fully our debt except within the confines of many volumes, so many disciplines does it encompass—including the most important of all: philosophy, forever associated with Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle.

Perhaps most important of all, let us remember that Greece was the birthplace of the democratic ideal. The Athenians were prepared to pay to defend it against the major powers of the ancient world. And, centuries later, their descendants are still concerned with defending and cherishing this ideal. We have seen their courage against various aggressors displayed over and over again, most recently in their fight to keep Greece free during and after the Second World War.

It is, therefore, with pride that I acknowledge the debt of the civilized world, and especially the United States, to the achievements of Greece, and the indomitable courage with which they have defended their liberties throughout history.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with particular pleasure that I pay tribute today to the Greek nation on the occasion of Greek Independence Day. As the only Member of Congress of Greek origin, I naturally take special pride in this celebration of the 144th anniversary of the start of the Greek struggle for independence.

It was on March 25, 1821, that the Greek people declared their independence from the oppressive Ottoman Empire. Although the Greeks had tried unsuccessfully to throw off Turkish rule many times during their 450 years of bondage, the effort launched on March 25, 144 years ago today, was destined to succeed. The lonely struggle of the Greek people against the power and force of the massive Ottoman Empire aroused the sympathy and support of Europe and America and finally, after 7 years of intermittent warfare, the determination of the Greeks, combined with assistance from her friends abroad, succeeded in achieving the long-sought-for goal of Greek independence.

It is fitting that we in America should join the Greek people in celebrating this great moment in Greek history for several reasons. One of these is our debt to Greece for many of our American institutions, most strikingly our democratic system of government. The impact of Greek philosophy, art, literature, and political thought has contributed immeasurably to our own civilization. The emphasis on the dignity of man and the freedom of the human mind which marked Greece's golden age has been a rich legacy which has helped to shape our American traditions of law and government.

Moreover, the millions of Greek immigrants who have come to our shores have enriched our land. Greek-Americans have made impressive contributions to our national life in many fields.

The natural sympathy that has long existed between the American people and the people of Greece was enunciated during the Greek war of independence by President James Monroe when he said:

> Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States.

The ties that linked our two nations in the 1820's have been further strengthened in the intervening years. Our countries have stood together in war and in peace: as allies during World War II; in the Greek struggle against Communist guerrillas just after the war; and today in the NATO Alliance.

It is thus with a deep respect for the Greek people and for the independent nation which their courage and determination have created that I join with my fellow Americans in marking Greek Independence Day.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 144 years ago, Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of revolt at Kalavryta on March 25, 1821, and opened the Greek struggle for liberty against the Ottoman Turks. For almost four centuries, Greece had formed part of the Ottoman Empire. Greeks had been frequently persecuted for their religion. They had endured an oppressive system of taxation which in its cruelest form required one out of every five male Greek children to become part of a Turkish infantry corps known as the Janizaries. By the time of the Napoleonic Wars, the Turkish Empire had entered a period of decline. The Turkish administration in Greece had become a lax and corrupt bureaucracy which invited revolt. The flame of nationalism, fanned by revolutions in North America, South America, and France, spurred the Greeks to seek their long-lost liberty.

The struggle was to be long and bitter. It immediately attracted the attention and sympathy of Americans who had so recently fought with success for their own independence. In many American communities, groups were formed to send aid to Greece, and in public forums, American leaders expressed their support for the Greek cause. Thus President Monroe on December 3, 1822, said that "the mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible." He regretted "that such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden."

He expressed the hope "that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth." Daniel Webster, while pleading for American support of the Greek effort, pointed to the debt that Americans and all peoples of the Western World owed to Greece. He spoke as follows:

> This free form of government, this popular assembly, the common council held for the common good, where have we contemplated its earliest models? This practice of free debate, and public discussion, the contest of mind with mind, and that popular eloquence, which if it were now here, on a subject like this, would move the stones of the capital—whose was the language in which all these were first exhibited? Even the edifice in which we assemble, these proportioned columns, this ornamental architecture, all remind us that Greece has existed, and that we, like the rest of mankind, are greatly her debtors.

The Greek cause also attracted sympathy in England, France, and Russia, although the support rendered to the Greeks by the governments of these countries was not entirely disinterested. The Russians hoped to eject the Turks from the Balkans; the French and the English did not wish to see the Turks replaced by the Russians. The Greeks benefited by these rivalries. When their success seemed in doubt, the Russians, French, and English came to their assistance. Following the decisive naval battle of Navarino of 1827, Greece secured her independence by the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829 and the London Protocol of 1830. Only gradually and through sustained efforts, however, was Greece able to extend her boundaries to include many Greeks left under foreign rule by the settlement of 1830.

Mr. Speaker, in our own century, the Greeks waged a new struggle for their liberty. This time, the American Nation, now grown mighty and determined to aid free nations resisting external aggression and internal subversion, was able to extend substantial material assistance to the Greeks in addition to moral sympathy. Thanks in part at least to aid given under the Truman doctrine, Greece is a strong and independent nation today. It is obvious that ties between this Nation and Greece are long-standing and many. I am confident that they can only increase and be further strengthened in years to come.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, 1965, presents us with an opportunity once again to acknowledge our debt, indeed the debt of the whole world, to the civilization and achievements of Greece.

On this date, 144 years ago, the people of Greece rose against the domination of the Ottoman Empire with the intention of once again becoming a free and independent state. For 9 long years they continued this battle, until, with the aid of Great Britain, France, and Russia, they finally achieved their goal of full independence. It is not inappropriate to ask why the major powers of Europe came to their assistance. The answer is not hard to find; perhaps it is best to quote the words of one of our own Presidents, James Monroe, who said:

> The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. * * * A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth.

For in fact it is to Greece that the United States and the other nations of what is referred to as "Western civilization" trace their origins. In this small country in the millenium before the birth of Christ there occurred one of the greatest flowerings of the abilities and talents of mankind in recorded history.

Pericles, the ruler of Athens during the Golden Age, once said:

> If all things are fated to decline, at least say of us, O future centuries, that we built the most famous and the happiest of cities.

I think that we, here and now in the 20th century, more than 2,000 years later, can agree with him. Over the span of human history since that time, the names of that place and time are still bright: Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, the fathers of philosophy, who organized and systematized ideas of human conduct and the regulation of human affairs, and whose speculations on ethics and government have formed the base of later theories and models. Bertrand Russell once described the history of our civilization since that time as nothing much more than a series of extended and often tedious footnotes to Plato.

Other names still live. The literature and drama of ancient Greece includes the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripedes; the comedies of Aristophanes and Menander, and the poetry of such varied figures as Homer, Hesiod, Aesop, and Sappho. The sculptures of Praxiteles, Pheidias, Polyclitus are renowned. In the sphere of architecture, succeeding generations have copied and recopied the magnificent Greek models: the Parthenon, the Propylaea and others of the Acropolis, as well as temples and public buildings still standing in such sites around the Mediterranean as Paestum, Delphi, and Syracuse.

And what of Greek science and mathematics? Hippocrates, the father of medicine, whose oath of service we still use; Euclid, the father of geometry; Hipparchus, the father of trigonometry; Appolonius; Archimedes; and perhaps most important Aristotle, who insisted that scientists should apply inductive reasoning to their researches.

Although the ancient Greeks lived in a world of natural and human disaster, their unquenchable curiosity about the world around them, their logic, and their desire to explain this world in human terms released them and their spiritual descendants from the innumerable shackles of superstition, taboos, and inherited beliefs. They resorted to inductive logic, mathematics, and founded the many sciences. They created and worked in nearly all the arts: dance, theater, painting, sculpture, poetry, and prose. In doing so, they established many of the esthetic standards by which we have judged succeeding works.

Mr. Speaker, let it not be thought, however, that the modern-day descendants of these famous Greeks have not retained their ability to excel in the various fields of human endeavor. The works of such authors and poets as Nikos Kazantzakis and George Seferis, who won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1963, are well known throughout the world. In the other arts, Elia Karan, Michael Cacoyannis, Dimitri Mitropoulos, Yannis Tsarouhis, and Giannoules Halepas are similarly well known for their achievements in drama, cinema, music, painting, and sculpture.

But, despite their great achievements the various city-states of Greek antiquity were able to unite politically only once—in order to defeat the armies of the Persians. This inability led to their annexation by Philip of Macedon and his famous son, Alexander the Great. Yet, through Alexander's ambition for a world empire and his admiration for Greek learning, Greek civilization was spread to all of the territories which he conquered, forming the basis of the Hellenic culture which was to become the standard of the ancient world.

The death of Alexander and the breakup of his empire led to the conquest of the Greeks by the Roman Empire in the second century B.C. Although Greece became a province of Rome, Athens continued to be a center of learning and culture which wielded tremendous influence throughout the Empire. Then, when the Roman Empire split, Greece became a part of, even the heart of, the Byzantine Empire for more than a thousand years. During this period, the Greek genius once again flowered, producing the great art and culture of Byzantium.

After the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans, the Greeks, although allowed considerable autonomy, felt the lack of freedom. In their first unsuccessful attempt to assert their independence in 1770, they were decisively defeated. By the end of the 18th century, the Greek people, despite numerous differences, were developing a strong sense of national consciousness. The increasingly wealthy and powerful middle class began to challenge the primacy of the prelates and the old provincial aristocracy; even more important, it enthusiastically embraced the revolutionary ideology of the French Revolution.

On the eve of that memorable day, 144 years ago, March 25, 1821, the Greeks had become a significant power. The population amounted to over 3 million, and their military strength was greater

than at any time since their occupation by the Ottoman Turks. In addition, they possessed a readymade navy of several hundred ships, the result of treaty provisions between the empire and Russia. Likewise, the Greeks had the capital resources necessary for a revolution. But, above all, they had developed a national consciousness and a determination to win their independence—by force of arms if necessary.

Throughout the early 1820's, the battles between the Greeks and the Ottoman Turks produced only a stalemate. Then the Ottoman Sultan called upon one of his vassals for assistance, and the Greek revolution appeared doomed. The apparently hopeless situation changed almost overnight with the intervention of the great powers; although they interfered because of the fear that the whole balance of political power in Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean would be destroyed, there was another important motive.

The tremendous intellectual awakening and ferment which the Renaissance had occasioned made the peoples of Europe aware of the debt which they owed to Greece. Groups of sympathizers with the plight of the Greeks exterted powerful pressures on the governments of the great powers for intervention in the Greek war of independence. And, individuals from all over Europe voluntarily offered their services toward this goal. Undoubtedly the most famous of these was Lord Byron, the famous English poet, who lost his life at the Battle of Missolonghi.

The efforts of the Governments of Russia, Great Britain, and France however, cannot be said to have been entirely disinterested. The Russians, for example, wanted to drive the Ottomans out of the Balkan Peninsula, and the French and English were concerned that Russian power there would only replace Ottoman power. Able to take advantage of these rivalries, Greece finally secured her independence with the blessings of these three great powers by the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829 and the London Protocol of 1830.

The years following independence were concerned with internal consolidation and acquisition. Thessaly, most of Epirus and Macedonia, Crete, and the majority of the Aegean Islands were added to the kingdom. And, only gradually was Greece able to settle her constitutional problems, involving dynastic difficulties and the search for a responsible and popular monarch. It was not until the election and accession of Prince William of Denmark, who took the title King George I of the Hellenes, that many of these problems were settled. The new King promised to uphold and defend the constitution of 1864, which proclaimed a monarchical democracy.

The independence which the Greeks had won after nearly 10 years of effort was threatened at various times, but never as severely as during the Second World War. Although the country had been torn by internal strife after the First World War, the unprovoked attack by the Italian Army on October 28, 1940, was sufficient to unite the people of Greece to a new defense of their liberties. Under the great army commander, Gen. Alexander Papagos, the Greeks were able to repulse the initial attack. In the spring of 1941, however, the Germans came to the aid of the Italians, and began the invasion of Greece, for they needed to hold the Balkans if the attack on Russia were to be effective. The King and his government fled into exile, and a 3½-year period of occupation and privation set in. Greece suffered severe damage to her economy—the merchant marine was reduced by 75 percent, industrial production fell by 80 percent, the railroads were inoperable, the roads were more than 50 percent destroyed. When the Germans finally withdrew in 1944, there remained only devastation and complete political and economic chaos.

The end of the war, however, did not mean that the travails of the Greek people were at an end. Elements of the Greek resistance movement had fallen under Communist domination; they refused to surrender their arms and called for the formation of a new Greek republic. Throughout the immediate postwar years, these forces received support from Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia—all under the control of the Communists. A bitter civil war was slowly draining the life out of what was left after the havoc of the World War.

Early in 1947, Great Britain, also facing an economic crisis as the result of the war, said it could no longer continue her financial and military support of the Greek Government. President Truman asked and received from Congress the authority to begin immediate financial and military aid to Greece. This commitment, known as the Truman Doctrine, proved to be the catalyst for effective action in the civil war. By 1949, with the defection of Yugoslavia from the bloc and the closing of its border to the Greek guerrillas, as well as the efforts of an American military mission under General Van Fleet, the Greek Government was able to force the last remnants to either surrender or take refuge in Albania.

With the civil war over, the Government was finally able to turn its attention to internal development. As a result of American aid, amounting to over $1 billion under the various aid programs, and the determined efforts of the Greeks themselves, the recovery of Greece was effected.

Since the recovery program was begun, Greece has made truly impressive progress in stabilizing its economy: The output of various minerals has increased by over 50 percent, the production of electricity has increased by over 150 percent, and one of the traditional trades of the Greeks of yore as well as today, merchant shipping, has gone from about 500,000 tons in 1946 to over 5 million tons.

The measure of the Greek success is also provided by the fact that Greece had achieved sufficient political and economic stability to be accepted for associate membership in the European Common Market. At the same time, Greece has not shirked her responsibilities as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, providing the West with eight divisions.

No survey of Greece could end without some mention of the role of the Greeks in countries other than their own, including the United States. For centuries, from ancient colonies all over Sicily, southern Italy, and the northern coast of Africa in antiquity, to cities on all the continents of the world today, Greek immigrants and their descendants have added their talents and skills to those of others. Today, then, we acknowledge the Greek contribution to that unique blend of cultures which makes up the United States.

Mr. Speaker, when Americans today seek to express the ideals of our democratic society, they might turn to the pages of Thucydides, one of the great Greek historians, who reports the words of the funeral oration of Pericles:

> Our constitution does not copy the laws of neighboring States; we are rather a pattern to others than imitators ourselves. Its administration favors the many instead of the few; that is why it is called a democracy. If we look to the laws, they afford equal justice to all in their private differences; if to social standing, advancement in public life falls to reputation for capacity, class considerations not being allowed to interfere with merit; nor again does poverty bar the way; if a man is able to serve the state, he is not hindered by the obscurity of his condition. The freedom which we enjoy in our government extends also to our ordinary life. There, far from exercising a jealous surveillance over each other, we do not feel called upon to be angry with our neighbor for doing what he likes, or even to indulge in those injurious looks which cannot fail to be offensive, although they inflict no positive penalty. But all this ease in our private relations does not make us lawless as citizens. Against this fear is our chief safeguard, teaching us to obey the magistrates and the laws, particularly such as regard the protection of the injured, whether they are actually on the statute book, or belong to that code which, although unwritten, yet cannot be broken without acknowledged disgrace.

This was the ideal of ancient Greece; it remains today the ideal of our own Government and democracy, and a lasting tribute to the genius of Greece.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Today, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the other Members of Congress in paying tribute to the Greek people on the occasion of the 144th anniversary of their independence.

The rebirth of a free and independent Greek nation 144 years ago is certainly an important milestone in the history of mankind. The courageous Greek people, who were the first to practice democracy and independence in ancient times, declared their independence of Turkish rule on March 25, 1821, but did not emerge as a sovereign state until 11 years later, when their freedom was assured by the Convention of London.

Since that time Greece has become a valued member of the community of free nations and is one of our stanchest allies in the free world struggle against communism. We should be proud of the effectiveness of the cooperation that has existed between Greece and the United States in the entire history of our rela-

tions and which is especially strong at the present time.

In conformance with the historic friendship between the Greek and American people, the United States should certainly develop a practical foreign policy position on the question of Cyprus. The lack of leadership by the Johnson administration in this field is an international tragedy. Truly responsible leadership on the part of the United States should have produced by now enosis of the island of Cyprus with Greece, while safeguarding the rights of all residents of the island.

Greece, which developed Western civilization as we know it, continues to provide an ever-increasing role of leadership in the preservation of our modern society.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 144th anniversary of the independence of Greece. In their homeland and in many nations which, like ourselves, have received immigrants from Greece, this 144th anniversary is being celebrated today. We are proud to honor this anniversary, for there are no more independent people or greater lovers of freedom than the people of Greece.

I think that we should take the time to reflect upon the courageous efforts of the Greek patriots who fought against overwhelming odds to gain their independence.

Although dominated for centuries by Ottoman rulers, the freedom-loving people of Greece never lost sight of the goal they have set for themselves and kept the hope that some day they might free themselves from oppression.

The first great step of the valiant fight for freedom by the Greek people from Ottoman rule was taken on March 25, 1821, when Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of liberty of the Church of Aghia Laura. This revolutionary banner was blessed and the call to battle issued. Greeks by the thousands answered the call and the long campaign for independence began.

The Greek fighters were inspired by the successful revolution which occurred in America only a few years before and which brought about the existence of our great Nation. The example of the American Revolution had planted the seed of freedom which had taken deep root among the other freedom-loving nations of the world.

The efforts of those courageous Greeks impressed the freedom-loving people of the United States. The youth of America at that time was keenly interested in the struggle for human freedom which it saw going on in Greece. Some young men volunteered to serve in the Greek armed forces, with the realization that this cradle of Western civilization—the Greek nation—must not remain enslaved. Among those Americans who distinguished themselves in this battle for freedom were such well-known personages as Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, Capt. Jonathon Peckham Miller, Gen. George Jarvis, and a host of others.

This country took a firm stand in favor of the Greek patriots, and America's popular feeling was officially reflected in the 1822 message to Congress made by President James Monroe which set down the famous Monroe Doctrine. In promulgating this doctrine, he stated:

> A strong hope has been entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. It is believed that the whole civilized world takes a deep interest in their welfare * * * their cause and their name have protected them from dangers which might, ere this, have overwhelmed any other people * * * there is good cause to believe that their enemy has lost forever all domination of them; that Greece will become an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank is the object of our most ardent wishes.

The determination of the Greek people to be free and independent was not to be denied. With the aid of sympathetic volunteers from all over the world, the justice of the Greek cause prevailed and the yoke of Ottoman rule was shaken off and complete independence came to Greece in 1832.

America owes much to Greece, not only for her great contributions to culture and education, but also for the important role that the Greeks have played as a bulwark against communism and Communist aggression in the eastern Mediterranean, as a member of the NATO alliance. The Greek Government has granted the United States the use of its airfields and naval facilities and the Greek Army is supplied with modern arms and equipment under the NATO agreements. Thus, the role of the Greek nation in the free world is a vital and significant one.

Persons of Greek descent may well be proud of their cultural and political heritage with their contributions to government. The contributions of Greece to the cause of human liberty have been great and lasting.

Our commemorating of the Greek Independence Day serves as a reconfirmation of our devotion to democratic principles and of our faith that the idea which came into being a thousand years ago in Greece will surely win over the powers of darkness which threaten the world today.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district I have many good friends who are Americans of Greek extraction. Many of them are Greek immigrants who came to America because America loomed great in their minds as the promised land. They have grown with America and have become leaders in business, the professions, and in the civic and public life of our community. I join with them in honoring Greek Independence Day and assure them of continued support for their historic efforts to strengthen the structure of their social and economic life.

I feel sure that the coming years will enable the people of Greece to enjoy continued freedom and economic well-being, which they so richly deserve.

I salute the gallant Greek nation with these words, "Zito Hállas." Long live Greece.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, every year the 25th of March provides us with an opportunity to pay our respects to the intellectual achievements of the Greek people, as well as their steadfast and wholehearted commitment to democracy, and defense of the best of Western ideals.

In fact, today represents the 144th anniversary of the independence of the modern state of Greece. Yet I am sure we are all aware that it is impossible to even talk about Western civilization without mentioning the contributions which the Greeks throughout history have made. Indeed, it is in the ancient city-state of Athens that the idea of democracy was first discussed and applied. The great minds of antiquity—Socrates, Plato, Aristotle—debated and analyzed the myriads of possible political systems, and many of their insights remain valid to the present day. At the same time, others were founding or shaping the outlines of a great number of the arts and sciences with which we are all familiar: poetry, drama, painting, sculpture, and architecture; geometry, trigonometry, zoology, botany, physics, and mathematics. Our world today would be a far more primitive place had not these and other Greeks first begun to explore and explain their surroundings in meaningful human terms.

Lest it be thought that their successors on that rocky peninsula achieved nothing, we need only recall the culture and glory of the Byzantine Empire, as well as the achievements of Nikos Kazantzakis, George Seferis, Elia Kazan, Dmitri Mitropoulos and many others in our own time.

The determination of the Greeks to fight for their heritage and their ideals has been demonstrated time and again, from the battle of Thermopylae, to the battle of Missolonghi, to the battle of Athens during the Second World War. We are, therefore, privileged and honored to acknowledge our debts to Greece, and our friendship and sympathy for the Greek people. I take this opportunity to add my own best wishes to those of others on this anniversary, and express the conviction that the glory of Greece and the closeness of our relations with that country will forever remain.

Mr. Speaker, Greek achievements and accomplishments are known to me because I have many Greek constituents. I have the greatest admiration and respect for those whose ancestral bond is to Greece. Their contributions—religious, civic, athletic, social, political, cultural, economic—have considerably enriched my home community of Rochester, N.Y., and earned the Greeks the lasting friendship of their fellow citizens.

So, on this occasion while my thoughts are meant for all Greeks, they are prompted particularly by my appreciation and affection for those I have the honor to represent in Congress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, March 25 is not only Greece's national holiday, but it is the date on which the seeds sown by the Founding Fathers of the American Republic bloomed on another continent for the first time.

On March 25, 1821, an overwhelmingly outnumbered, valiant band of Greeks rose against their foreign ruler,

as they had done every generation for four centuries, only to be beaten down every time in waves of terror that spared neither humans, nor animals, nor even trees—this ruler had systematically destroyed the forests and orchards of Greece.

But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed because the rising of March 25, 1821, was designed to succeed, perhaps because the new American Nation had established that all nations have the right to live in freedom. The American Nation supported the Greek fighters for freedom and thus the Greeks, who first established freedom as the one true basis of government, became independent once more.

Mr. Speaker, in the 144 years since, Greece has been a faithful and gallant ally of America. In the First World War, the Second World War, the fight against Stalinist domination of Europe, and the Korean war. In the fight against Communist terror, the American Government helped the Greeks materially, and they won, beating back an invasion launched by international Communists, and set an example that we would like to see emulated in Vietnam and elsewhere. The Greeks won because their people could be trusted to fight, gun in hand, for freedom, as they had always done—most notably in the glorious struggle which began on March 25, 1821.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, civilization owes much to ancient Greece, but it owes a great debt to modern Greece, also.

Greece of old gave us heroes and sages on whom to pattern a way of life at the same time that it nourished a spirit of freedom that not even centuries of oppression could extinguish.

The hopes that inspire freedom-loving men everywhere burned on through Roman, Byzantium, and Ottoman Empire occupations, burned bright enough to light a war of liberation that lasted almost a decade.

The war of independence that brave Greeks launched on March 25, 1821, a date which today all free men celebrate, unfortunately had to be rewon many times.

But none of the enemies of freedom finally prevailed, and it is a glory to all of us that the flood that was post-World War II communism broke, finally, on the stone wall that was Greece.

Mr. Speaker, the people who are free, and the people who one day will be free, together owe and will owe a great debt to the people who cradled our Western civilization.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on this historic occasion, it is highly appropriate that we should pay fitting tribute of congratulation, gratitude, and admiration to the Greek Nation and the infinitely great Greek people both at home and abroad.

Little we say could adequately express the feelings of affection and pride we have for our Greek-American friends and neighbors for their tremendous contributions of superb citizenship, marvelous achievements for our free way of life and the warmth of their friendship and the depth and inspiration of their patriotism. Surely, in these great respects, no other people in this or any other country could possibly excel them.

And there is another thought which inevitably prompts our wonder, pride, esteem, and appreciation in unlimited and glowing terms today, and that is the glory of the Greek heritage and the great debt which we share in common with all other civilized nations for the truly indescribable benefits and blessings conferred by that epochal heritage upon all mankind.

Hellenism is more than a nationality, more than a racial entity, more than a passing phase of contemporary life. It is a great, ancient, deeply entrenched world culture infusing virtually every type of civilization in the world, an influence for good and beauty and the "golden mean" that touches profoundly into many ways of life, particularly those like our own that are animated primarily by full recognition of the worth and dignity of individual man and rest upon the freedom and moral authenticity of the individual human being.

The cult of the beautiful, the supremacy of moral and familial values, the dialog of personal liberty and the exaltation of the human spirit which the ancient Greeks brought forth and gave to the world, form, in truth, the very basis of our philosophy and practice of ordered free government and the modes and customs of our everyday life.

I could go on and on to recite the wonders of Greek law and culture, Greek art, literature, Greek sculpture, philosophy, science, mathematics, democracy and general culture and the immortal contributions of the Greeks to us and to world civilization.

But I could talk for many hours and days and never fully encompass the wide range, deep impact and most significant effects of Greek contributions to this great country of ours and to many other great countries, not only in this generation, but throughout the long channels of history.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Greeks of antiquity and of the present-day world. I am proud and grateful for what they have done for mankind, for America, for all our people, and for our Nation.

And I am proud of their warm, inspiring friendship and personal loyalty which means so much to me. How fortunate we are to have them as great, constructive forces in our America.

And how fortunate the world is to have such a great people, wedded to all the finest principles of freedom, democracy and justice which their ancestors did so much to fashion and promulgate to the world, as neighbors, as friends and as steadfast fellow workers in the protection and enrichment of that freedom.

How fortunate we all are that the glorious Greeks are with us. May they long endure to shed their light and their warmth on struggling humanity and honor and sustain us with their devoted friendship.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, Greek patriots raised the flag of liberty and swore to win freedom or die in the attempt. On this anniversary occasion it is becoming that we here in the Congress of the United States should review and give expression to our great and everlasting debt to ancient and to modern Greece and the people of Hellenic blood. After our own Revolution the Greeks were the first nation of Europe to throw off an alien yoke and fight for national freedom. While our own freedom may have been a source of inspiration to the Greeks, we, in turn, derived from Greek history much guidance.

Alexander Hamilton, while agreeing that a federal government should be an association of independent communities, argued for a strong central government. He said:

> Theory is in this case fully confirmed by experience. The amphictyonic council had, it would seem, ample powers for general purposes. It had in particular, the power of fining and using force against delinquent members. What was the consequence? Their decrees were mere signals of war. The Phocian war is a striking example of it. Philip, at length, taking advantage of their disunion and insinuating himself into their councils, made himself master of their fortunes.

Madison, also a student of the history of Greece, warned that no foreign power should ever be permitted to deal with separate states. He pointed out that the Kings of Persia and Philip of Macedon through intrigues with the amphictyonic confederates, destroyed their league.

Madison's Journal, and other notes and journals of the Constitution, are filled with references to the experiences of the Greek cities and lessons derived from their mistakes which were applied by Madison and Hamilton to our own situation and to our profit.

Not only is Greek history interwoven with our Constitution, both through philosophy and warning against errors, Greek philosophy is discernible in our political science. In his Politics Aristotle uses the term "politics" meaning "citizens."

The early Athenian Government gave people freedom of thought, speech and action. Its laws were designed to benefit all citizens. Their early experiment with democracy came nearer to providing justice for all citizens than any form devised before or since that time.

In the field of science, Hippocrates is known as the "father of medicine." His code of medical ethics is expressed in the pledge:

> With purity and holiness, I will pass my life and practice my art. Into whatever houses I enter, I will go there for the benefit of the sick and will abstain from every injurious act and corruption. Whatever in my professional practice—or even, not in connection with it—I see or hear in the lives of men which ought not to be spoken of abroad, I will not divulge. While I keep this oath unviolated, may it be granted me to enjoy life and the practice of the art, always respected among men, but should I break or violate the oath, may the reverse be my lot.

This oath is still subscribed to by those who practice medicine. It is not surprising that medicine made great strides under the leadership of Hippocrates. He recognized the value of keeping and studying case records.

One of the most noted of Greek scientists was Aristotle, who wrote on such subjects as physics and biology. He explained the use of the lever a hundred years before Archimedes was born.

Two Greek scientists, Leucippus and Democritus, advanced the atomic theory.

John Stuart Mill wrote:

The Greeks are the most remarkable people who have yet existed * * *. They were the beginners of everything, Christianity excepted, of which the modern world makes its boast * * *. They were the first people who had a historical literature; as perfect of its kind * * * as their oratory, their sculpture, and their architecture. They were the founders of mathematics, of physics, of the inductive study of politics, of the philosophy of human nature and life. In each they make the indispensable first steps, which are the foundation of all the rest.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, one of our stanchest and most steadfast allies, in the struggle against godless communism, has been Greece. The Greeks were among the first to feel the heavy hand of Communist terrorism and banditry. By extending a helping hand in 1947, we were able to help Greece overcome her Communist insurgent problem, and go on to again become a viable nation and later a valued member of the NATO alliance. In so doing we partially repaid the debt we all owe to our heritage of Greek civilization and democracy. It is therefore fitting that on the occasion of her 144th anniversary, we again remember our debt to this valiant little Mediterranean nation. It is with these thoughts in mind that I wish to insert in the RECORD this statement by the Royal Greek Embassy:

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY, MARCH 25, 1965

March 25, 1821, marks the first European echo of the American Revolution. On that date, 144 years ago, a band of dedicated freedom loving Greek patriots raised a flag of liberty and swore that they would have freedom or die in the attempt. It was not the first time that the gallant remnants of the brave Greek nation had risen against foreign domination. For more than four centuries of alien domination, they had fought for liberty regularly, on an average every 11 years. Each of those attempts was drowned in blood and destruction.

But the 1821 rising was destined to succeed. Fighting against incredible odds, accepting stoically the price not only in blood but in property that the alien rulers exacted, the Greeks fought on amid their smouldering homes and burning orchards—for the trees, too, were destroyed to quench the spirit of liberty—and 8 long years later they won, as the Americans had won earlier, thus affirming for the first time in Europe the right of nations to rule themselves.

They found scant support from other European governments at first, those brave Greek fighters. The great capitals of Europe were more concerned with the balance of power, with supporting Turkey, whom they called then the sick man of Europe, rather than allowing the Greek subjects of the Turk to gain freedom.

But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed. The example of the American revolution had sown seeds that had grown deep roots. Freedom lovers from other nations came to offer their lives in the cause of Greek liberty. Greeks are proud that Americans participated in that noble endeavor.

In 1821, when the Greeks rose against the Turkish Empire to throw off a yoke of nearly 450 years, to the average American, Greece was either a remote country, somewhere in Europe, or an ancient civilization, famous for its books and buildings. Soon, however, Greece became a real and immediate entity. The Greek struggle for freedom stirred the American press, aroused American orators and stimulated the neoclassic trends in American art, literature and architecture. American opinion was unanimous: a people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy, a nation fighting for its liberty, should be free.

The first American to sponsor the cause of Greek liberty was Edward Everett, professor of Greek at Harvard University. A man of strong convictions, Everett was determined not only to make speeches for Greece, but to act. In the name of Greece he initiated a crusade against the reactionary and oppressive policy of the Holy Alliance in Europe.

His efforts for Greek independence were to bear fruit, and a year later popular feeling was officially reflected in President Monroe's annual message to Congress, which declared: "Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring, and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their [the Greeks'] contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

The Greeks, on their side, looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in May 1821, was the delivery of an address to the American people, beginning, "Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers: Having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode * * *. Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue."

It was natural for the American institutions of higher learning to take the lead in aiding the Greek cause; there intellectual freedom was upheld as the cardinal aim in education, and youthful enthusiasm for justice and liberty ran high. From Harvard University came the signal for America's support of Greek freedom. It was given by Edward Everett 6 years before the outbreak of the Greek revolution, in his oration for the degree of master of arts in 1814, which he called "The Restoration of Greece." It contained many prophetic notes. Judging by later reports, his listeners were carried away by the eloquence with which he pleaded for an independent Greece. After graduation from Harvard, Everett visited Hellas on the eve of its independence. He wrote an engaging account of his experiences in Greece during 1818 and 1819 which unfortunately has never been published.

It was Everett who guided Daniel Webster in his famous address on Greece, delivered before the American Congress.

Soon interest in Greece spread beyond Everett's campus at Harvard. Throughout the 1820's, students in American public schools, colleges, and universities were holding meetings, passing resolutions and writing expressions of support for the Greek cause.

The youth of America at that time was keenly interested in the struggle for human freedom which it saw going on in Greece. Some young men volunteered in the Greek armed forces. Young George Jarvis, Jonathan Miller and Samuel Gridley Howe distinguished themselves on the Greek battlefields. Their own American revolution was only a few decades past; the interim years had seen the writing of the American Constitution and the careful construction of a republic on the foundations of freedom. Theirs was not merely a passive interest in what was happening in Greece; they felt that their own ideals and lives were involved, and, over 100 years ago, they felt America could not remain isolated.

Eventually, the heroic sacrifices of the Greeks could no longer be ignored. Public opinion in the civilized world was revolted by the brutal suffering of a small heroic nation that was obviously determined to die fighting rather than live in bondage and the great European powers swung their weight behind the Greeks who, at last, obtained for themselves the benefits of freedom, an idea that they gave to the world.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to include their remarks in tribute to this anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FARM POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand the results of an independent survey which was conducted by a group of leaders in my home State of Iowa. I would like to share with my colleagues the results of this survey which is one of the clearest and most definitive statements for the direction of farm policy by a nonfarm group that I have ever seen.

The group which conducted the survey is an organization known as the "Iowa 99 Legislative and Advisory Group." This group is composed of one rural leader from each of the 99 counties in the State. They were assisted by the statistical department at Iowa State University in Ames.

Their objective is to spotlight and emphasize the problems of our rural economy and recommend necessary measures to legislative groups at State and National levels. In order to canvass the opinion and thinking of a major business group, this committee recently asked the State's 849 bankers to give their views on procedures for improving the farm economy and on a broad range of public policies.

So far there has been an unbelievable 50-percent response from the bankers, most of it from those of the smaller towns of the State where bankers are closest to people of the farms and have quick, continuing communication with them. I also feel this was indeed an excellent group to survey since all of us are most aware of the part financial institutions play in our economic stability. I, of course, am deeply interested in this activity and have more than a casual interest in the opinions of the bankers of Iowa, being a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee. Even more important, I represent the Seventh Congressional District in which 68 percent of the people live in the rural areas. This is why I am so vitally interested in what the bankers think about farm policy.

Certainly you need not be reminded of the depressed conditions of our family farmers as a result of the continuing downward trend in farm income. There is, of course, a growing appreciation of

the relationship between income opportunities for the family farmers of our Nation and the economic well-being of people who live and work in the towns of our rural areas. I must admit that it was a pleasant surprise to find the degree of understanding that was expressed by bankers of Iowa in this vital survey.

At this particular time, as all of us anxiously await the President's farm bill, I think it is most appropriate that we carefully solicit the opinions of everyone and heed the needs of our family farmers which have such a great impact on the economic conditions of our main street businesses. I want to take this opportunity to commend the Iowa committee of 99 for their efforts in collecting these opinions. After reading them, all of you will, I am sure, agree that these were not leading but were most explicit and left no doubt as to the intentions of the individual answering them.

The failure of the great majority of our family farmers to receive parity of income equal to the incomes of other segments of our economy is being reflected in the unfavorable business conditions in the towns which provide farm families with goods and services. I want to point out and emphasize to both my rural and nonrural colleagues that unless action is taken soon to further improve the farm income situation the pinch will be felt in cities large and small across our great Nation. They are directly or indirectly dependent upon farm and nonfarm rural customers for the products of their factories, plants, and mills. I am sure, therefore, that the opinions expressed by these Iowa bankers in this timely questionnaire will be of great interest to each of you. This is especially true since Congress will consider action this session on a broad range of farm and food legislation.

Asked if they would favor a 4-year extension of the present or similar farm program, more than three-fourths of the bankers responding to the questionnaire, specifically 77 percent answered "Yes."

In response to the question "will termination of all farm commodity price supports have a favorable or unfavorable effect upon your community," 63 percent said such termination would have an unfavorable effect—27 percent said "favorable."

Sixty-eight percent of the bankers responding to the questionnaire are against elimination of farm price supports, and 55 percent say that farmers cannot solve their problems without Government help.

In response to the question as to whether or not businessmen in their communities are doing better now than in the previous 4 years, 40 percent said business conditions had worsened this year, 26 percent said the situation is unchanged, and 30 percent said business was better.

The majority of the bankers responding to the questionnaire—namely, 60 percent—feel that farmers in their areas are now making some financial progress. In view of the answers to farm program questions, I think it only fair to conclude that farmer-Government cooperation is contributing to the modest progress that has been made since the start of the current feed grains program.

With figures reflecting percentages, a summary of the qestionnaire returns are as follows:

1. Do you think farm price supports should be eliminated? Yes, 26; no, 68, no response, 6.

2. Can farmers solve their problems without Government help? Yes, 33; no, 55; no response, 12.

3. The Kiplinger letter stated that within 5 years most, if not all, commodity farm supports will be gone. If so, will it affect your community? Favorably, 27; unfavorably, 63; no response, 10.

4. In 1964, President Johnson sent a mission to Europe to promote high quality meat trade. Would you favor that our Congressional Agricultural Committee should further this type of meat promotion in major foreign cities? Yes, 96; no, 4.

5. As agricultural exports are the largest U.S. dollar earner, do you favor feed grain and soybean exports to Russia and satellites? Yes, 69; no, 30.

6. Do you favor agricultural exports to China? Yes, 34; no, 53.

7. Would you favor credit selling to expand our agricultural exports? Yes, 34; no, 60.

8. Would you favor helping shipowners so that we can equally compete with other grain exporting nations who have lower operating costs? Yes, 52; no, 41.

9. Would you recommend using foreign ships at lower cost? Yes, 35; no, 58.

10. Would you favor the present or similar farm program extension of 4 years? Yes, 77; no, 19.

11. What method would you favor to keep farm production prices in balance? More effective controls, 20; increased exports, 42; present system, 15; no response, 23.

12. Should there be a concerted effort to get major farm groups to join forces to gain more effective long-run benefits for agriculture? Yes, 85; no, 9.

13. Are businessmen doing better, worse, or the same as during the last 4 years? Better, 30; worse, 40; same, 26; no response, 4.

14. Do businessmen in your area feel their income is directly tied to agricultural income? Yes, 92; no, 5.

In his agricultural message to the Congress last February 4, the President of the United States said:

> Farm policy is not something separate. It is part of an overall effort to serve our national interest, at home and around the world.

I am hopeful that when the major items of farm and food legislation come before the Congress the President's accurate observation of the widespread impact of agricultural policy will be remembered.

The family farms of the United States do far more than keep millions of Americans supplied with an abundance of top-quality foods at fair prices. They are customers for billions of dollars worth of goods and services that move out to the countryside from cities and towns. They can continue their fine record of production, and be increasingly good customers, only if Government gives them the cooperation essential to their achievement of earning opportunities comparable to those experienced by the other segments of our economy.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues for careful study the survey results contained herein, and call your particular attention to the understanding and sympathetic concern that has developed in the banking fraternity for the agriculturist and his problems.

It is my hope that this material will assist this Congress in developing an answer that will serve the best interests of our Nation through the improvement and continuation of a program that has proven its value during the past several years.

Mr. HANSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

USE OF CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, AND RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the House of Representatives to discuss the subject of the use of chemical, biological, and radiological weapons. Much has been said here and abroad in the last 72 hours as a result of the use of American-supplied tear gas-type chemical weapons by the South Vietnamese.

The facts reported in the press are these: On January 27, 1965, the South Vietnamese encountered a village in Phu Yen Province on the southern tip of the Vietnam peninsula that had been infiltrated by the Vietcong. The mission of the South Vietnamese was to capture the village. They had the choice of attacking the village on foot, by bombing from the air, or by shelling with artillery or mortar fire. This is virtually the same situation faced day after day in the war in Vietnam. In this case gas was used. The gas incapacitated all within the village permitting the South Vietnamese to enter the village, capturing Vietcong and gaining control of the village. The gas used is characterized by the Defense Department as a riot-control-type gas similar to tear gas, having no residual effect. As the Secretary of Defense has said, the gas was used for the purpose of saving lives.

Statements released by our headquarters in Saigon on Tuesday confirmed that gas was used by the South Vietnamese, that the gas was provided by the United States and that it was released from dispensers in helicopters provided by the United States.

Subsequent Defense and State Department statements confirm that three types of gases have been available to the South Vietnamese from our supplies and that

these gases include the following three agents:

DM, a pepperlike irritant that causes sneezing, coughing, headaches, tightness in the chest, nausea and vomiting. It incapacitates a victim for a half hour to 2 hours.

CS, a recently developed tear-inducing agent that irritates eyes, nose and respiratory tract and causes chest pains, choking and vomiting. Its effects last 5 to 10 minutes.

CN, a tear-inducing irritant that also causes irritation to the skin. Its effects last about 3 minutes.

The Defense and State Department statements further indicate that the authority to use these riot-control-type gases had been delegated to area commanders, presumably for that purpose—riot control, and that the decision to use the gas had not previously been cleared with either the Pentagon or the White House. According to news reports, Secretary McNamara and Secretary Rusk first heard of its use in combat in news stories. The White House has stated that the President did not know of its use or approve of it in advance.

It is not clear from information available to me whether the South Vietnamese initiated the request for gas to use in such situations or whether our military authorities in the field pressed its use upon the South Vietnamese.

On September 3, 1959, in the face of growing interest then being shown by our military in the development of chemical, bacteriological, and radiological warfare weapons and techniques, I introduced a resolution, House Joint Concurrent Resolution 433, which reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby reaffirms the longstanding policy of the United States that in the event of war the United States shall under no circumstances resort to the use of biological weapons or the use of poisonous or obnoxious gases unless they are first used by our enemies.

At that time my efforts were attacked as providing the Communist world with an opportunity to twist my words to their advantage and to place the United States in a bad light. My response to this charge then, and it is most relevant to the situation we find ourselves in today, was that we must reaffirm our longstanding position against the use of these weapons unless they are used against us first. Furthermore, President Eisenhower's supporting statement against first use gave all the support necessary on this issue.

Such has been our policy ever since President Delano Roosevelt first enunciated the policy in 1943 when he said:

Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of mankind. This country has not used them, and I hope that we never will be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies.

Furthermore, the tone of all correspondence which I had with the State Department with regard to the concurrent resolution mentioned earlier confirmed that our capability was designed as a defensive effort and not for the first use. I read now from a letter from the Department of State dated January 15, 1960, which concludes with the quote from President Eisenhower:

With respect to U.S. policy governing the use of biological and chemical weapons in war, this is a matter in which any policy decision involving their use rests solely with the President of the United States. At his news conference of January 13, 1960, the President responded to a question bearing directly on this matter. When asked about U.S. policy with respect to being the first to use these agents in war, the President said in part that, "So far as my own instinct is concerned, is to not start such a thing as that first."

I hope you will find the foregoing information of assistance.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

Both Houses have studied the question of the use of CBR weapons in warfare. A fine report was made by the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In its report, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, dated August 10, 1959, on "Research in CBR Warfare," commented on this aspect of the use of these weapons:

It must be made perfectly clear that the United States does not seek to find any opportunities for using these or other forms of warfare. The natural revulsion against the bizarre effects of both old and new CBR agents make them ready targets for international propaganda campaigns.

The great body of public opinion still adheres to this view of gas warfare. The New York Times in an editorial on Wednesday which ended with the sentence, "Gas is a wretched means to achieve even the most valid ends," begins with the following two paragraphs:

The United States, in steady escalation of the Vietnamese conflict, is now revealed to have employed a nonlethal gas. It is possible to argue, as American military and civilian spokesmen do, that military objectives can be achieved with fewer casualties by using a gas that does not kill.

This argument overlooks one vital factor; and it displays, at the very least, a lack of imagination somewhere in the top echelons of the armed forces. People—ordinary people everywhere—have a strong psychological revulsion, if not horror, at the idea of any kind of poisonous gas, even a temporarily disabling type that only causes extreme discomfort including nausea and diarrhea when used against ordinarily healthy adults. But even this kind of gas can be fatal to the very young, the very old and those ill of heart and lung ailments.

The Washington Post in a similar vein commented bitterly in its lead editorial on Wednesday as follows:

The argument that the nontoxic gas is more merciful than antipersonnel weapons has some merit, but not much. The trouble is that although the gas may not be poison, the word is, and all the propaganda resources in the world cannot explain away its employment as an act of Christian charity and humanitarian mercy.

Two principal arguments echoed in these editorials are made with some effect in favor of using nonlethal gases in a war of this kind. The first contention is that the use of gas is a humane means of accomplishing tactical missions which are otherwise very costly in terms of the lives of civilians as well as military. The second is that since the gas is nonlethal and without prolonged effect, it is a desirable weapon to use in guerrilla-type war where the guerrillas are intermingled with noncombatants.

The humaneness argument rings a little hollow since we are supporting the South Vietnamese at the same time with napalm and white phosphorous which are in themselves inhumane weapons. Horrible as these weapons are, however, they are an accepted part of the standard military arsenal. They were used in World War II and Korea. Whether they ought to be or not, they are not part of the forbidden CBR family.

More important, however, the humaneness and nonlethal arguments used in favor of these gases are beside the point.

This is the central issue: The use of gas by any nation creates a precedent for later use by other countries of other gases. Its use represents the first opening of the box in which humanity has kept the arsenal of these weapons sealed since the First World War. Any use of these weapons opens the door to the use of other more lethal and inhumane weapons. The questions we must ask before using these weapons are: Are we to unilaterally open up this box of horror weapons before all mankind? Are we to reverse our past policy of so long standing in such an offhand fashion? I believe our answer is and should be a resounding "No."

Let us look at some of the weapons or agents which have stayed locked up in a sort of Pandora's box. The agents available to us are presumably available to others including the Communist world.

I will first consider some of the chemical agents available today—others may now be available with other more bizarre effects:

Blister agents: These are cumulative poisons, such as mustard, nitrogen mustard, and lewisite. They are rapidly absorbed through the skin. They not only blister, but can cause blindness and attack many internal organs, including the lungs, bloodstream, and digestive tract.

Choking agents: Principally phosgene, it attacks the lungs so that the victim progressively moves from coughing to drowning in the liquid which accumulates in his own lungs. It also brings on nausea and vomiting and the victim goes into shock. With this gas and its attendant symptoms in the background, it is not surprising to have world opinion respond with indignation at the introduction of the use of gases, blithely dismissed as merely causing nausea.

Blood gases: These include hydrogen cyanide, cyanogen, chloride, and arsine. These, in concentration, are very deadly. They travel via the lungs to the bloodstream to stop the transfer of oxygen in the blood with consequent severe effects, particularly on the central nervous system.

Tear gas and vomiting agents: These are considered harassing agents and their

effects, while acute, pass in ordinary circumstances. Vomiting agents also may be used in combat in the hope of making men remove their protective masks to become vulnerable to more deadly attacks.

Nerve gases: These constitute the real significant change in weaponry in this field. They cause casualties before they can be detected by the human senses. Less than a minute of exposure is lethal. As gases, they travel via the lungs, although a liquid droplet will penetrate the skin. They disrupt nerve signals to the muscles. Symptoms begin with respiratory troubles, salivation and perspiration, vomiting, cramps, involuntary elimination and leading through convulsions to death.

I next turn to biological agents: Five classes of micro-organisms represent the primary classifications from which biological warfare agents can be drawn:

First. Fungi are most commonly usable against plants, although San Joaquin Valley fever is a fungus infection which attacks man.

Second. Protozoa are a possibility, but are difficult to grow and transmit. Malaria and amebic dysentery are diseases of this type.

Third. Few bacteria are harmful, but some important disease types exist. Potential biological warfare agents are anthrax, brucellosis, glanders, tularemia, plague, bacillary dysentery, and cholera.

Fourth. Another group are the rickettsiae, including typhus, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, and Q fever.

Fifth. The next category consists of the viruses, such as influenza, psittacosis, and Venezuelan equine encephalitis.

In past wars, epidemics among men have often taken as many lives as the battlefield, even though the diseases were spread by natural rather than artificial means. The artificial introduction of diseases to populations not used to them can have a powerful effect. There is also the possibility some laboratory will come up with a new mutant strain which is more virulent than the normal forms.

Radiological agents are a less well-known and understood matter. They are classed in two groups: Those which may derive from a controlled reactor or accelerator and are disseminated by means similar to chemical or biological agents, and those which are deliberately created by the explosion of a nuclear or thermonuclear device at the combat location.

A fourth category testifying to the capability of laboratories to widen the range of these heinous weapons includes the psychochemicals. These agents or incapacitating agents as they are known fall into two groups: First, those which produce temporary physical disability such as paralysis, blindness, or deafness; and second, those which produce temporary mental abberation. Unlike the lethal war gases or the more virulent biological agents, these incapacitants can produce purely temporary effects without permanent damage. In this respect they more nearly resemble the riot-control gases or some biological agents which are deliberately not killers. But in another respect, they are quite different. They act swiftly, and their arrival may not be heralded by any human senses except as to the effects realized.

The discussion of incapacitating agents brings us back to the use of gas by the South Vietnamese. The gas used there is described as a form of tear gas or nauseating gas used to incapacitate the victims. The step from tear gas to the use of the most modern psychochemical incapacitating agent, on close analysis, is a short one. The steps to the other gases are short ones, too, and not within our control, once the weapons have been used.

It must be remembered that nonlethal gases were used by both the French and Germans in World War I. With the precedent of the use of such gases established, it was not long before the lethal gases were employed with such long-lasting and anguished effects.

The use of gas in Vietnam is of grave concern to me, particularly in the light of a recent statement by our Ambassador to Vietnam, Maxwell D. Taylor. General Taylor, in a speech to the Saigon Lions Club on March 22, 1965, is quoted with reference to American employment of weapons in the area in an AP dispatch in the Washington Post, Tuesday, March 23, as follows:

> What has been done thus far is public knowledge. What will be done in the future is something for Hanoi to worry about.

The significance of this statement, it seems to me, is not only that it portends a willingness on our part to use weapons and tactics which may or may not embrace the CBR arsenal—and I trust and hope it does not—but it also makes quite clear that these steps will be taken in secret, on the premise that these measures have been given the silent assent of the American people. This entire situation also emphasizes the risks involved in allowing our military commanders to take actions which may effect changes in policy. Of course, when we rely heavily on military action, this is one of the ever-present dangers that must be guarded against.

I feel the time has come to let the President know how we feel about these and other steps taken in the name of national necessity. I can recall the fate of another great nation which accepted the morally repulsive as a national necessity.

I personally feel there is time to take the action necessary to reaffirm our commitment to the traditional standards governing the conduct of war.

From all reports I have seen, including Secretary McNamara's statement describing the agents used, the decision to provide gas to the South Vietnamese for use in combat was made by our military commanders in Vietnam without consultation with the Defense Department, the State Department, or the President. I believe an investigation is needed to determine how our military commanders are able to violate what is established national policy of long standing. I and several other Members of Congress have addressed a letter to the President containing a request for such an investigation. We have also called upon him to restore exclusive control and direction over the use of chemical, biological, and radiological weapons to the Presidency and, in the light of prior Executive pronouncements of policy against our first use of such weapons, to provide the world with a statement of this administration's policy in this area.

In this way what clearly appears to be a unilateral violation of our policy of no-first-use can be rejected as a violation of policy rather than accepted as a reversal of policy. In this way our national prestige and moral standing can be maintained.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FINO.

Mr. CORBETT.

Mr. PILBIN in five instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. FLYNT to revise and extend remarks to be made by him in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HANLEY in two instances.

Mr. JOELSON in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. MCVICKER.

Mr. MACHEN.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 26, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

801. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audits of Government Services, Inc.,

and its employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan for the year ended December 31, 1964; to the Committee on Government Operations.

802. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs incurred for commercial protective service used for shipments of classified material, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

803. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of financial condition and operations, for fiscal years 1962 and 1963, U.S. Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Government Operations.

804. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs incurred in the relocation of highways at the Amistad Dam project, U.S. Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Government Operations.

805. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs resulting from inadequacies in the administration of the Inter-American highway program in the Republic of Panama, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

806. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of weaknesses in negotiation and administration of contracts for resettlement of Cuban refugees, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

807. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of records proposed for disposal pursuant to 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

808. A letter from the president and national director, Boys' Club of America, transmitting an audited financial report of the club for calendar year 1964, pursuant to Public Law 84–988; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

809. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a copy of the annual report of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1964; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

810. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

811. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Governor of Guam for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 6(b) of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENTON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 6767. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 6732. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 6733. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for addition to the Adams National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6734. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on communications services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 6735. A bill to provide competitive equality between State and National banks with respect to branching powers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By MR. DULSKI:

H.R. 6736. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 6737. A bill to correct inequities in the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act and in other laws governing civil service retirement benefits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6738. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 22 if he is attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 6739. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6740. A bill to provide a rent certificate program for low-income housing in private accommodations, to establish a priority for low- and middle-income housing in urban renewal projects, to provide additional rehabilitation and relocation assistance, to create a new veterans' mortgage insurance program, to continue the Federal Housing Administration, college, and elderly housing programs, to provide comprehensive compensation for condemnees, to insure efficiency and economy in the administration of Federal housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6741. A bill to encourage the preservation and development of a modern and efficient passenger rail transportation service in the northeastern seaboard area by granting the consent and approval of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York to negotiate and enter into a compact to create their own Northeast Rail Authority, and by guaranteeing certain loans and other credit to such authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6742. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that small business corporations which elect to have their shareholders taxed in the manner provided in subchapter S may elect to have distributions made in the first 2½ months of a year treated as if made on the last day of the preceding year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 6744. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6745. A bill to require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 6746. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over State canals, river regulating reservoirs and facilities or power projects incidental thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6747. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over streams and other bodies of water the navigable portions of which lie within a single State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 6748. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on household-type electric air heaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6749. A bill authorizing an additional appropriation for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6750. A bill to eliminate the population limitation as it affects the eligibility of communities in redevelopment areas for certain benefits under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 6751. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 6752. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 6753. A bill to declare the old channel of the River Raisin in Monroe County, Mich., between the Monroe Harbor Range Front Light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 6754. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor

beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 6755. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 6756. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 6757. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 6758. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6759. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 6760. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6761. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 6762. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 6763. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6764. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 6765. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6766. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 6767. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 6768. A bill for the relief of the Kensal School District, North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 6769. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals and the closing of such hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 6770. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 6771. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to remove the limitations with respect to relocation payments made for moving expenses of persons and businesses displaced by highway construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 6772. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6773. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6774. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 6775. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6776. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 6777. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6778. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6779. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to proceedings against certain witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 6780. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 6781. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general [redacted] service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6782. A bill to amend the National Firearms Act to impose special (occupational) taxes with respect to engaging in the business of importing, manufacturing, and dealing in destructive weapons such as bombs, grenades, rockets, missiles, bazookas, and antitank guns, to impose taxes with respect to the making and to the transfer of such weapons, and to increase the rates of special (occupational) tax, transfer tax, and making tax imposed by the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6783. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6784. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6785. A bill to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 6786. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 6787. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 6788. A bill to authorize certain modifications of the project for Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 6789. A bill to authorize certain modifications of the project for Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 6790. A bill to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6791. A bill authorizing an additional appropriation for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6792. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for the improvement of urban mass transportation in the northeastern United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 6793. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By. Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6794. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 6795. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first, second, and third class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6796. A bill to provide a percentage deduction for certain expenses paid for the higher education of the taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 6797. A bill to amend Public Law 503, 84th Congress, so as to provide annuities for

the widows of certain Foreign Service officers who retired prior to the effective date of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6798. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Latin American Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 6799. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6800. A bill to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6801. A bill to authorize mortgage insurance and loans to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine and dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6802. A bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6803. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 6804. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 6805. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 399. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.J. Res. 400. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 401. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate November 23, 1965, as Repudiation Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 404. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial statue to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of American rocketry; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 405. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 370. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to prosecutions for war crimes in the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 371. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 292. Resolution authorizing cards of identification for certain officers and employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Res. 293. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representative with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Res. 294. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Res. 295. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 296. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. Res. 297. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Res. 298. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Res. 299. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the continuation of recent efforts on the part of the President to secure a universal condemnation of anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H. Res. 300. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study the operation of hospital facilities by the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 301. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the responsibilities of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 302. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that oppression of minorities in Rumania through a systematic plan launched by the Communist regime in control of Rumania be condemned and the President of the United States is requested to take appropriate steps in our relations with the Rumanian Government as are likely to bring relief to the persecuted minorities in the controversial Transylvania region of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

144. By Mr. SENNER: Memorial of the Arizona State Senate to expand veterans' hospital facilities within Arizona; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

145. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting full appropriation support for the commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964; to the Committee on Appropriations.

146. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States supporting legislation to direct a survey to determine the feasibility of dredging a waterway between Tenakee Inlet and Port Frederick; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6806. A bill for the relief of Wah Kin Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6807. A bill for the relief of Carmen Yaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 6808. A bill for the relief of Vibeke Langballe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6809. A bill for the relief of Miss Stella Klaridopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6810. A bill for the relief of Yi Joo Wang, Sue Juan Luan, Sue Shiang Luan, Regina Luan and Jean Luan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 6811. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of Clayton B. Heilner against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6812. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Badulato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6813. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lamberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 6814. A bill for the relief of Antonio Salati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6815. A bill for the relief of Domenico Venditti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 6816. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Pastilha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6817. A bill for the relief of Leo Temmer, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6818. A bill for the relief of Miss Patricia Peghini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 6819. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orhan Metin Ozmat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

142. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council, Chicago, Ill., with reference to urging enactment of legislation for open registration and voting rights for all American citizens, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Edward Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY H. McVICKER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the people of Colorado and the people of this Nation lost a courageous and able leader. Edward Keating, a former Member of the House of Representatives who served with great distinction, was a man of purpose and vision whose efforts on behalf of the labor movement brought forth a series of accomplishments that will stand as a monument to his great generosity and spirit of justice. He possessed wisdom and insight which led to his understanding of the free enterprise system and the course it would take in history, and his was the sense of perspective which enabled him to recognize the role that labor would take in American enterprise.

Edward Keating was born in Kansas on July 9, 1875, the youngest of nine children of Stephen Keating, an Irish patriot who fought for Ireland's freedom and was forced to flee to America in 1848. His father died when Edward Keating was only 5 years old, so Mr. Keating knew early in his life what it means to work hard and to attempt to overcome poverty. But Mr. Keating grew up to be an inspired man. He transcended the hardships of his youth with a consuming desire to serve his family and his fellow man.

The energy which was to characterize his activities in the Congress and in the labor movement was immediately apparent at the outset of his career. He entered the newspaper business as a copyholder, but rose rapidly to become a reporter for the Rocky Mountain News. His career flourished as he accepted more and more responsibility, and in short succession he became city editor, managing editor, and finally became editor of the Rocky Mountain News, where he served from 1906 to 1911. He served as the president of the International League of Press Clubs during 1906 and 1907. Mr. Keating served as president of the Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners from 1911 to 1913.

In 1913, his service was rewarded by the people of Colorado with his election to the U.S. House of Representatives, where he remained for a period of 6 years. During that time, he was responsible for several notable pieces of legislation concerning the labor movement.

Soon after his retirement from the Congress, he became the editor of Labor, a dynamic paper that fought for the interest of the general public as well as for that of the American worker.

Edward Keating was a man of purpose whose life was notable by a series of considerable accomplishments. But probably the greatest monument to his achievements, and the one in which he would take most pride, is the great number of families that enjoy better homes, education, and medical care. His death is a great loss to the people of his State and his country, whom he served so nobly.

Disabled Veterans and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include herein a press synopsis of a speech I recently delivered before the Disabled American Veterans at Southbridge, Mass., in my district, with reference to the closing of the Rutland, Mass., VA Hospital and the most deplorable events at Selma, Ala.:

DISABLED VETERANS AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Before the Disabled American Veterans at Southbridge Sunday, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN made a dual attack on the proposed closing by the Veterans' Administration of the Rutland VA Hospital and what he termed the "hideous brutality and savage mistreatment of Negroes and whites at Selma, Ala."

"In the name of our immortal veterans, Rutland VA Hospital must be kept open," said PHILBIN, "and in the name of everything that is sacred in this country, the inequities of Selma must be speedily redressed, voting rights assured to all, and civil rights in every respect be safeguarded and enforced.

"There is no way that anyone could possibly justify the closing of the Rutland VA Hospital. It is necessary, yes imperative, to provide proper hospitalization and care for the veterans of central Massachusetts, indeed our entire area.

"To transfer these veterans to other hospitals miles away from their homes, or even to other inadequate institutions near their homes is a shabby and completely unsatisfactory way to care for the needs of sick and disabled veterans.

"I have personally appealed to President Johnson in strongest terms not to permit VA to destroy, alter, or reduce the fine service Rutland Hospital is rendering.

"This is a time for this great organization and all veterans groups, and all relatives and friends of the veteran, 87 million strong, to demand their rights from the Federal Government.

"The abandonment of Rutland Hospital might save some relatively paltry sum for the Government, though this is very doubtful and has not been shown by the figures, but such action would visit our veterans and their dear ones with pain, anguish, and inconvenience that no economy measure could ever justify.

"I have been much encouraged by my talk with the President, and my colleagues in the Congress, but the struggle to keep Rutland Hospital open will be long and difficult, and we must continue our united front with all possible vigor and intensity, until we have achieved our goal of proper, comprehensive, modern medical care and treatment for our veterans."

Touching on the situation at Selma, PHILBIN said:

"The events at Selma are nauseating and sickening to all Americans, especially to veterans who fought to save the liberties and civil rights of everyone in this great, democratic Nation.

"We want no police state tactics here. We want no storm troopers, no Russian cossacks beating helpless people, white or black, whatever their color because they dare to stand up for voting rights, or other civil rights that are and must continue to be the birthright of every American.

"There can be no compromise on this issue. Congress has provided the law, and will continue to supplement it in every way necessary. But it is up to the executive department and the enforcement officials of this great Government to enforce the law, to protect the people in their right to assemble, to speak, to protect, and to vote, and to be treated as equals under the law.

"If these precious things cannot be secured in America to all people, then we shall be untrue to our own heritage of freedom, and we will become the laughingstock of the world.

"There can be no delay, equivocation or compromise. I hope and pray this issue can be settled promptly and effectively in an orderly way under the law without further bloodshed and trouble. At all costs it must be settled if it takes the armed strength of this Government to do the job. American freedom and justice must be guaranteed to all."

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day.

The people of Byelorussia, often known as White Russians, are an ancient people whose history dates back much further than that of the Great Russians. They are one of the more numerous and ethnically distinct peoples in the Soviet sphere. Although racially related to the Russians and other Slavic peoples, they have always had a distinct national character of their own which has remained with them to this day.

Their historic homeland lies east of Poland and west of Moscow, with its center in the famous city of Minsk. Byelorussia became part of the Russian Empire early in the 16th century, and remained as such until the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 which destroyed the czarist empire. The Bylorussians were among the non-Russian national groups which asserted their freedom and proclaimed their national independence. On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian National Republic was established.

But, as happened in so many other cases, these long-subjugated people were not destined for freedom. Early in 1921, before they had a chance to enjoy the fruits of their victory, the Soviet Red Army overran their country and made it a part of the Soviet Union. In less than 3 years, independent Byelorussia vanished, and today it continues to live only

in the minds and hearts of patriotic Byelorussians suffering under Soviet dictatorship.

Despite the heart-rending hardships endured by these people under one of the worst tyrannies known to man, the Byelorussians have not given up their hope for freedom. Let us continue our prayers that this day will not be far off so that these people may enjoy the blessings of freedom in their historic homeland.

Results of Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, recently I completed another poll of public opinion in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. This district lies to the north and east of the city of Pittsburgh wholly within Allegheny County. Its total population is 409,291, of whom 109,923 are registered Democrats and 108,092 are registered Republicans.

The 18th District of Pennsylvania features a great many industrial areas along the Ohio and Allegheny Rivers and has many strictly residential areas. It has a little farming in the sections farthest removed from the city and quite a little coal mining.

Most ethnic groups of any sizable importance are found in the district, with a higher than normal number of Germans and Italians.

An equal number of questionnaires were sent to Republicans and Democrats. No way of determining how many of each party responded was utilized. Only signed replies were counted. The percentage tabulations follow:

TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL CONDUCTED JANUARY 1965

1. All things considered, would you rate President Johnson's performance in office as (a) good, (b) fair, (c) bad? (a) 32 percent; (b) 55 percent; (c) 13 percent.

2. Do you believe that America's prestige in the world has improved in the last 4 years? Yes, 17 percent; no, 83 percent.

3. Should we (a) make greater efforts to win the war in South Vietnam, or (b) seek a truce and get out? (a) 56 percent; (b) 44 percent.

4. Do you have confidence that the U.S. dollar will for the predictable future remain one of the soundest currencies in the world? Yes, 68 percent; no, 32 percent.

5. Would you favor keeping the U.S. military out of Africa, except under United Nations auspices? Yes, 89 percent; no, 11 percent.

6. Would you vote to cut our Federal excise taxes at this time by approximately $2 billion? Yes, 56 percent; no, 44 percent.

7. Do you think the national minimum wage should be (a) kept at $1.25 per hour, or (b) raised to $1.50, or (c) be raised to $1.75? (a) 57 percent, (b) 32 percent; (c) 11 percent.

8. Should we abolish race and nationality in determining eligibility for immigration to the United States? Yes, 43 percent; no, 57 percent.

9. Do you believe that the administration's antipoverty program will substantially reduce poverty in the United States? Yes, 20 percent; no, 80 percent.

10. Do you favor President Johnson's proposal to advance $1 billion for public schools in poverty impacted areas? Yes, 66 percent; no, 34 percent.

11. Do you support Defense Secretary McNamara's plans to abolish the military reserves and reassign some of their units into the National Guard? Yes, 74 percent; no, 26 percent.

12. Would you favor the gradual elimination of our farm price-support program? Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

13. In considering medicare for the aged, would you prefer (a) it be financed out of general tax funds, (b) it be financed by increasing social security taxes, or (c) that no new program be adopted? (a) 31 percent; (b) 25 percent; (c) 44 percent.

14. Do you believe that it is good for the country that the Democrats have a 2 to 1 majority in the House and Senate? Yes, 15 percent; no, 85 percent.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to commemorate the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian Independence, for in so doing we are remembering a brave and courageous people. The Byelorussians have displayed an inspiring commitment to the ideals of freedom and independence, goals which were realized in 1918. And even though their sovereignty as a nation was suppressed shortly thereafter, they have not yet relinquished this wonderful ideal.

The declaration of independence which the Byelorussians made in 1918 was to bring to fruition the long-cherished dream of freedom. Sadly, however, it was not to be that, "From now on the Byelorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power," as they so boldly stated in their assembly and fervently believed in their hearts. Within a year this nation was to be converted into a battleground, becoming a pawn in the maneuverings of enemies. Occupied first by the Red Army and then later by the Polish Army, Byelorussia was partitioned by these two powers in 1921, signalling the suppression once again of an independent republic and a national aspiration.

The rule of force, however, cannot obliterate the truth: That Byelorussia is a nation of culturally united people, speaking one language is a truth that cannot be denied. That the Byelorussians are an ethnically oriented people, working toward distinct goals is evident. That the Byelorussians wish to become a vital member of the international community is clear, though at present, even with U.N. membership, it is impossible for Byelorussia to raise her own, distinct voice.

It is with great admiration that we salute these people who yet hold to the ideal of national sovereignty and independence. We join with these long-suffering people as well as those Byelorussians who have become part of our American nation in the prayer that their aspirations shall be realized.

Congressman Monagan's Brilliant Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very brilliant book review recently appearing in the New York Times written by our very able, outstanding, distinguished, and beloved friend, the esteemed gentleman from Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN.

This article reviewed the recent books, "Home Place" by the distinguished journalist, William S. White, and "House Out of Order" by our very able and distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING, both books dealing in various ways with the House and the Congress, its rules and procedures, some current criticisms and proposed reforms.

I think that Congressman MONAGAN has put both these books in proper perspective and his commentary will be a very valuable, lasting contribution to the subjects and questions discussed.

I take pleasure in congratulating and highly commending my valued, esteemed, and dear friend, Congressman MONAGAN, on his fine, superbly written book review. Truly, it was a gem of clarity, wisdom, and commonsense.

The book review follows:

A MEMBER TAKES THE FLOOR

(By JOHN S. MONAGAN)

The open season on Congress continues. Nearly every week sees the publication of a new book viewing clinically and usually unfavorably the Members of our National Legislature and the congressional institution itself. Senators, like JOE CLARK of Pennsylvania, give their view halloo and join the hunt. The alumni magazine of the former Congregational Indian School in New Hampshire, which I had the honor to attend, recently juxtaposed, with what I hope was unconscious humor, pictures of the school's nine better-than-average congressional alumni with an article entitled "Can Congress Survive?" by a Ph. D. faculty member. Even Pageant magazine turned an inquiring eye on Capitol Hill last November and sandwiched its notorious "rating" of congressional Members between articles on "Kissing After Marriage" and ads explaining how to remove hemorrhoids.

Two books on the House of Representatives now arrive to join the swelling tide on this fascinating subject. In spite of their rather arch titles, "Home Place," and "House Out of Order" are stimulating and knowledgeable and, therefore, welcome. However one may view their conclusions, they have the authority and genuineness that are lacking in too many legislative studies and can come only

from prolonged exposure to Representatives and representative assemblies.

From the point of view of experience it would be difficult to find people more competent to dissect the House than William S. White, columnist, congressional correspondent, and idolator of the Senate; and RICHARD BOLLING, nine-term Congressman from the Fifth District of Missouri. At the same time, one would be hard put to [redacted] a greater divergence of opinion than that reached by these pundits as a result of their dissection. White's view is generally friendly and constitutes a spirited defense of the status quo. BOLLING's is critical to the point of being waspish.

Chafing at the restraints imposed by the seniority system and committee review, BOLLING would reform the House by making the party caucus the supreme arbiter of policy and the ultimate source of committee nominations. Under this dispensation, the majority would be the strong right arm of the White House. WHITE, however, finds the seniority system inevitable but improvable and justifies the present procedure as necessary to constitute a vital legislative winnowing process and a means whereby this House of Congress performs its function as a coordinate branch of our Government rather than as a servile agent of the Executive.

Bandying epithets such as "legislative barons," "oligarchs" and "mandarins," BOLLING takes out after the House committee chairmen, labeling them "perverse" and "elderly" and charging them with frustrating the popular will as expressed in Executive proposals. His particular targets are the Rules Committee, which he calls an "abbatoir for liberal legislation," and its astute chairman, Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, whom he terms the director of the "conservative fugue."

WHITE, on the other hand, points out the role of the House in making "climatic decisions" in our national affairs, explains the necessity of committee work in an institution of 435 Members and singles out chairmen like WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, of Ways and Means; EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, of Judiciary; and GEORGE MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, of Appropriations, as men who are little known nationally, but who have done more than many well-publicized Senators to shape the financial, social, and defense policies of our Nation.

Recognizing the limitations of the seniority system, WHITE maintains convincingly that there is no viable alternative. While granting the recent obstructionism of the Rules Committee, he argues with force that it would have to be invented if it did not exist and that it can be bypassed whenever a determined majority so decides.

Viewed in proper perspective, BOLLING's strictures seem less tenable and WHITE's measured support more reasonable when one actually identifies committee chairmen such as the men named above along with MILLER, Democrat, of California, of Science and Astronautics, MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, of Foreign Affairs, PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, of Banking and Currency, and HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, of Commerce. Some of these men admittedly are no longer young, but they are clearly not opposed to progressive legislation. One may question, too, whether a House which in the last Congress produced a civil rights bill, a tax cut, legislation fostering vocational education and industrial retraining, financing for the wheat sale to Eastern European countries, a pay increase to Government employees, the antipoverty program, and increased [redacted]al security benefits can legitimately be described as a "shambles" and in "wretched condition" as charged by BOLLING.

All will agree that House procedures are far from perfect, and BOLLING provides valuable suggestions for upgrading in this area and in the fields of conflict of interest, length of congressional terms, control of campaign costs, selection of committee staffs, and improvement of committee hearings. Incidentally, as a progress note it should be pointed out that the House itself this year adopted a 21-day rule for discharging bills from Rules and also empowered the Speaker to route conference reports past Rules and directly to the House. However, when one compares our House with other assemblies in the world—the raffish and regimented House of Commons, the cowed Chambre des Deputês, and particularly the captive bodies behind the Iron Curtain—one can take pride in our achievement and status.

While discursive and uneven in style, "House Out of Order" provides an excellent analysis of congressional press relations, candid and sometimes irreverent portraits of House leaders, an interesting category of congresssional types, detailed and revelatory if somewhat self-congratulatory, sidelights on the passage through the House of the Landrum-Griffin and civil rights bills and a serious booboo in characterizing "Southie Is My Home Town," the alma mater of South Boston, as a "ribald" song. BOLLING's main proposal would split the Democratic Party or revive the Republican-Conservative-Democratic coalition.

"Home Place" is tight, well-organized and magnificently written. House members will take issue with White, however, on his undue reverence for the Senate and his criticism of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The unending monologs in the other body, the lack of germaneness and the action by the two major Senate rules of "unanimous consent or nervous prostration" are not admired by the orderly House. In his criticism of the committee, White seems unaware of recent subcommittee work and solid legislative achievement in a time of increased isolationism.

For the ultimate description of the House, White's words are appropriate. It is, he says, "a microcosm of the people of the United States themselves"—with all their virtues and all their faults.

Honored for Solar Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, while the United States probes outer space and attempts to learn the secrets of the sun and the stars, Mr. Harry E. Thomason, a patent attorney for the U.S. Army Materiel Command here, has harnessed the sun's rays and put them to work heating and cooling his house at 7354 Walker Mill Road in District Heights, Md.

Mr. Thomason recently was awarded $100 by the Army Materiel Command for his solar heat collector invention which he developed on his own time and separate from official duties. He voluntarily gave the U.S. Government free license to use this and several other of his inventions in solar heating and cooling.

Mr. Thomason's work in solar energy has been widely recognized. He and the solar houses he has built in suburban Maryland have been the subjects of articles in national magazines and in scientific journals.

The award he received is an honor justly accorded this attorney-scientist.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. HANLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian people, an anniversary sadly observed, for independence is a condition of the past for these unfortunate citizens of a proud country.

This tiny satellite country—a satellite in position, in government, but not in spirit, remains a constant reminder of the octopus arms of the Communist doctrine.

Byelorussia knows the harsh, brutal stamping of armies over her soil. Three and a half centuries of slavery are engraved on the pages of her history books; three and a half centuries of denial of human rights, dignity—oppression. Yet these bold people, never fearing suppressions, formed many governments to overthrow their foreign intruders.

We all remember the cruel annals written during the first World War. Byelorussia was not excluded. German armies captured part of the country and assumed military control. Russia controlled another segment. Finally, during World War I, the Byelorussian people proclaimed to the world that they were living and would continue to live. The Great National All Byelorussian Congress on December 5–17, 1917, decreed the state of order of Byelorussia and the rights and freedoms of its inhabitants and peoples.

On March 18, 1918, a constitutional decree established first the provisional form of the Byelorussian National Republic to create a completely independent statehood. By March 25, 1918, independence was reverentially proclaimed. The Government resulting from this proclamation expanded its activity in all fields of national life with the exception of the military—forbidden by the Germans. Important advances were made in the areas of education, culture, social protection. The Byelorussians tried to secure recognition from other states in order to open up diplomatic and consular offices in surrounding countries. The Republic was recognized de jure by Austria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and the Ukraine.

The German troops withdrew in November of 1918 and immediately the Red army began to advance into Byelorussia. The Byelorussian forces were insufficient to offer sizable opposition. However, the Government continued its efforts to form armed Byelorussian forces to defend the independence but to no avail.

Russian armies tramped through the country extinguishing the hope of the Byelorussian independence in their path.

The Polish-Bolshevik War ended with a treaty between the warring powers in Riga on March 18, 1921. Byelorussia, as a result was divided between Poland and Soviet Russia. Part of Byelorussia was given to Latvia and the other to the Russian Government. Eventually the Soviet Government was established after a war with the Byelorussians.

Today Byelorussia joins her neighbors in the suppressed struggle for national and individual freedoms—freedom of speech, of government. The candle of hope will burn through the rains of tyranny and the long expected dawn will eventually splash light on this unfortunate country.

The 47th Anniversary of Independence of Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, when the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918, their Democratic Republic was born.

This independence was achieved after many years of hope, struggle, and sacrifices. But victory and happiness turned to defeat and sorrow, for despite the courage and determination of the young Republic, Bolshevik forces soon overwhelmed it.

The Byelorussian-Soviet Socialist Republic was then created, but it does not represent the Byelorussian people—it is merely another Soviet satellite.

As we celebrate the 47th anniversary of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic's proclamation of independence, it is significant that the observance is made by not only Americans of Byelorussian descent and Byelorussian immigrants in the United States, but by the entire free world.

I know that some day, the independence and freedom the Byelorussian people lost 46 years ago, will be regained and preserved, for tyranny does not, and cannot endure.

It cannot endure, because it is conceived in evil, born in violence, and raised in despotism—and because it rules with force and injustice. It lacks popular support and therefore cannot endure.

But freedom, supplemented by strength and courage, can and does endure, because it is good and peaceful, governing with reason and justice. It enjoys broad popular appeal and does succeed.

That is why the Byelorussian people should not yield to despair. They should live with hope in their hearts, because some day they will be free again, for their courage and patriotism are strong and great.

Byelorussian Independence: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the anniversary of Byelorussian independence. It is a day upon which we of the free world pay tribute to a people who for a few moments in a period of international upheaval had enjoyed the right of self-determination.

In commemorating Byelorussian independence, one calls to mind one of the greatest principles ever proclaimed by man, and that is, the principle of self-determination. It is this principle that provides the pulsebeat of democracy, for what it means in essence is that the peoples themselves have the sole right to determine their own national destiny.

Self-determination, as a principle of politics, had been a product of the age of enlightenment. It is a product of the thinking of those great philosophers of democracy such as John Locke who believed that man had a natural right to govern himself. Today it is easy for us to become indifferent to the genuine revolutionary character of this idea. For its time, this principle of natural rights was indeed revolutionary, for it had taken shape in a political climate when all men by and large believed that kings of nations governed by divine right, that is, that their power and authority were derived from God and thus all men were bound by the absolutist declarations of their government.

The notion of natural rights of man, however, preached a different doctrine. It held that all men had certain inalienable rights that derived from nature itself and among those rights was the right of self-government. In other words, the commonly held notion of power and authority of government from above was reversed, and these rights were now said to be deposited within the people who through the exercise of those rights created their own particular form of government.

Thomas Jefferson had, of course, applied this wonderful democratic principle to the American setting. And he fused this principle with the evolving concept of American nationalism which had taken the concrete form of our Declaration of Independence and eventually our Constitution. Thus in America, what had been a matter of theory had now become a practical political reality.

At the same time, however, another new principle that would determine man's destiny was also evolving, and that was the principle of nationalism. The Western world had witnessed the marriage of the principles of self-determination and nationalism in America. And as the 19th century moved on it was to see both principles govern the thought of all men who sought national independence.

Byelorussians were moved by both of these principles, but not until their opportunity had arisen during World War I were they able to apply them in their full meaning. Byelorussians, along with the other suppressed peoples of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires, had seen a new hope for their Nations as the power of the former oppressors had dissolved under the impact of war. Fired by a deeply engrained nationalism and inspired by the principle of self-determination, the leaders of Byleorussia declared their national independence and set into motion forces which they hoped would make their aspirations a concrete reality.

Self-determination remains the dream of men everywhere. Few people are more aware of this than the Byelorussians, or White Russians as they are also known to us. These people are united by cultural tradition, a common language, a history of struggle and most of all a common hope for freedom from foreign domination.

On March 25, 1918, Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence. On that date the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born, and it appeared that this new Nation would take its rightful place among the free Nations of the world.

Unfortunately, those hopes were never to become a reality; not because of any failure in their national resolve, but rather because of the awesome power of the newly emerging Communist Russia whose military forces had swept over the territories of the former Russian Empire, conquering them again, and eventually reasserting a new and more terrible form of tyranny.

On this day of national commemoration it is fitting, therefore, that we Americans pay tribute to the gallant Byelorussian peoples. It is also fitting that we take this occasion to reassert our own faith in the principles of democracy, for it is in those principles that we find the strength to sustain ourselves as a Nation in the trials of the present and future, and it as also in those principles that we find the greatest inspiration for all men who seek a better life.

Humanitarian Work of New Jersey Rotarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the great humanitarian service being done by members of the Rotary Clubs in seven counties of New Jersey. The Rotary Club of Paterson, N.J., is very active in this great work.

These Rotary Clubs are soliciting medical and dental equipment as well as medical and dental textbooks to be sent to Rotary Clubs in India for distribution.

This material will ultimately be sent to an area which is principally rural in nature and contains approximately 130 million people. Although we have 1 physician for every 700 people in the United States, there is only 1 physician for every 5,000 people in this area in India.

The shortage of hospital beds in this area of India is even more shocking, and as a result disease and misery are rampant.

Dentists are practically nonexistent, there being only 1 for each 58,000 people, and the few dentists available there greatly need equipment.

I am proud that the Rotary Club of Paterson shows sufficient interest and concern to participate in this project, and I wish them success as well as the great satisfaction which comes from service.

Social Security Disability and Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been greatly concerned about certain interpretations by the Social Security Administration that have resulted in turning down a relatively large number of applications for disability benefits based upon what is in most instances essentially permanent and total disability.

Under the Social Security Act, the antecedent disability is defined "as of long and indefinite duration" and which prevents the individual from engaging in any substantial, gainful activity.

I believe it is the restrictive interpretation of this latter phrase which has resulted in the denial of many applications that would appear on their face to warrant favorable action.

I have personally known of numerous instances where persons were suffering from some serious heart condition, paralytic shock, or from serious personal injury, or other conditions which left them, not only completely disabled to perform any substantial gainful work, but completely and permanently disabled them from performing any work for the rest of their lives, and yet their applications were not favorably acted upon by social security.

I do not think that this result is in keeping with the intent of Congress, the spirit or the letter of the act, because I think considering the way the act has been written, it would be possible for the agency to make administrative interpretations that would cover cases which on the record and on the evidence would plainly appear to be instances of total, permanent disability without any question.

It is apparent to me that there are other deep-seated problems relating to social security that the Congress will have to continue to consider, such as the adequacy of current benefits. I appreciate, of course, that while that is of greatest moment to the recipients, it is also presenting extremely difficult, challenging problems to the Congress, since we must maintain solvency of the social security trust fund and we cannot take action that will result in impairing this fund in any way.

The alternative is of course to make reasonable adjustments upward of social security benefits and pay the difference out of the ordinary revenue of the Government. This would be a very expensive matter, and when it is considered, together with other matters affecting social security, it can readily be appreciated that the problem before Congress is really one of overhauling the entire social security system to make it more effective and responsive to current high costs of living and the needs of the disabled, social security recipients, and the needs of ordinary social security recipients, who are finding in increasing numbers that their payments are woefully and painfully inadequate to sustain them in advancing years.

These problems cover a great deal of ground and will continue to require to my mind a great deal of intensive and extensive examination, consideration, policy determination and expert draftsmanship such as would be best assured by long committee hearings and painstaking study.

It is clear that the general revision of the Social Security Act is needed and I believe that it would be very unwise to defer this action which also should include the integration of other social legislation related to social security that the Congress may consider and adopt. We cannot allow this great, valuable system to become a sprawling administrative nightmare.

I submit that it is not sound public policy to delay further in vigorously tackling these problems, because with the increase in wages, prices, interest, rents, and the advancing, inflationary spiral which at all costs must be kept within tolerable bounds, that the growing needs of social security recipients will result in serious inadequacies and injustices, if the benefits are not equitably adjusted to meet current costs and standards, and if the Congress fails to coordinate all purposes germane and related to social security in the overall cost to those covered, the employers and the Government.

One approach to these questions might well lie in a careful, massive, prolonged study by some commission of Government authorized by the Congress to review these matters and come up with appropriate recommendations for legislation to be submitted to appropriate committees of the House. But I urge prompt early consideration of these matters and meanwhile the effective adjustment by Congress of a proper legal formula that will insure prompt, reasonable disability benefits to those eligible members of the social security system, who can show by competent, medical evidence that current disabilities actually disable them from performing "any substantial work for the foreseeable future," and whose condition is tantamount in all practical respects so far as ability to work is concerned, to total permanent disability.

I want to express my thanks to the learned chariman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman MILLS, for his warm interest and his willingness to undertake a study of the problem of providing a suitable legal formula for the determination of disability benefits and for his many other contributions to this cause.

I propose to continue my interest and my labors in these matters in the hope that the Congress may take effective, equitable action in the not too distant future. It is mandatory if we are to make the social security system truly responsive to the needs, entitlements and deserts of the rank and file of the American people and after all, is that objective not our job?

Meanwhile, it is vital, as I see it, for Congress to move with all possible speed with the passage of the social security increases voted by Congress last year.

We must cut all red tape and end all unnecessary delay. The small relief this bill gives is sorely needed by very many fellow citizens who should have had these benefits, these small increases last year.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 47th anniversary of the Byelorussian declaration of independence. On that day in 1918, the hopes and aspirations of nearly six-score years were realized. A once-proud people joyfully welcomed the opportunity to demonstrate to the world that the long czarist oppression had not dulled their zeal for self-government. We are all sadly aware that the republic was short-lived; but, to my mind, there is a particular poignancy surrounding the Soviet takeover. For many among us do not comprehend the depth of the anguish which this unwarranted act created among Byelorussians, both in the homeland and around the world. The reason for this is that a great number of individuals, in the United States and Western Europe, assume this people to be a group native to Russia. On the contrary, Byelorussia is a separate entity, with its own language, culture, and customs. It is for these very reasons, coupled with the memory of past independence, that the people of this nation never capitulated in the face of czarist rule and oppression. They remembered a period, several centuries before, when their nation had flourished, and had made significant contributions to the progress of Western man. These sentiments gave rise to several courageous revolts, each of which was crushed by the forces of imperial

Russia. The Byelorussian people displayed the same independent courage under the Communist yoke, and in the famous Slutsk uprising of 1920, heroically battled against impossible odds, in the full knowledge that if unsuccessful they would experience even greater cruelty and reprisals. The Red army wiped out the resistance, fierce vengeance was taken, and a foglike silence enveloped the country.

Let no one be deluded by the absence of physical revolt since 1920. History shows that the Byelorussian people have not given up. Quite the contrary, the flame is very much alive. Having been subjugated for all but 3 of the last 170 years, they have developed a singular capacity for passive resistance, and it is this quality which sustains them now, and in which the Kremlin can find no solace or comfort. By one means or another greater measures of freedom will come.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1965, marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence. The German occupation of western Byelorussia during the First World War had provided an opportunity for the leaders of Byelorussia to express their love of freedom and their longings for independence. Although the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty between the Central Powers and Soviet Russia on March 3, 1918, ignored these aspirations for liberty, on March 25, 1918, the valiant national council proclaimed Byelorussia an independent republic.

The Byelorussian state had little chance to survive despite the bravery of its people. With the defeat of Germany, the Soviet Government repudiated the Brest treaties. Occupying all lands evacuated by the Germans, the Soviet proclaimed a Byelorussian xxxxx on January 1, 1919. In the peace treaty between Poland and the Soviets in March 1921, Byelorussia was partitioned between its two large neighbors. The Second World War, however, ended with almost all of Byelorussia within the Soviet border.

Today the Soviets make some pretense of permitting a special status for the Byelorussian xxxxx It is a signatory of the United Nations Charter and signed the partial test ban treaty in Moscow. We know, however, that the Byelorussian people have been completely subjugated to the Soviet Communists and are among the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, without basic political rights, without fundamental freedoms, and without the opportunity for self-determination.

We in the United States have a living link with the people of Byelorussia in thousands of Americans of Byelorussian ancestry and Byelorussian immigrants who have helped to build our country. As the leaders of the free world, we have a special responsibility to sustain the love of freedom among all people. As freemen we must sympathize with all those behind the Iron Curtain who are denied the priceless rights of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion.

Because of our devotion to freedom, it is fitting that we pause a moment in our daily work and join with Byelorussians throughout the free world and our countrymen of Byelorussian descent in celebrating this anniversary of the proclamation of an independent Byelorussian republic. We reaffirm that the maintenance and strengthening of freedom around the globe is the main tenet of American foreign policy, and that we have faith that freedom will ultimately win in the never-ending struggle against tyranny. We take this occasion to assure the Byelorussian people that they have not been forgotten by the free world. We understand their plight, and sympathize with the hope for freedom that they must keep hidden from Communist sight. It is our wish that the day will come when all men may live in a world of peace and plenty and, above all, of freedom.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the First World War many submerged and almost lost nationality groups regained their freedom and attained sovereign and independent status. That was one of the most welcome results of a terrible and most destructive war. Subject nationalities of once powerful but now crumbling empires threw off the yoke of their oppressors and proclaimed their freedom. The Byelorussian people, who had been held down under the Russian czars for centuries, proclaimed their national independence on March 25, 47 years ago.

The people of Byelorussia had their own sovereign, independent state before the rise of the Russian Empire. Then, centuries ago, they were overwhelmed by the Russians, lost their independence and suffered under the czarist autocracy of Russia. During the long period under the czars, they carefully guarded their national traditions and their heritage, never abandoning hope for a chance to regain their national freedom. They therefore seized upon the welcome opportunity provided by the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia, and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918. They established their own democratic form of government in their historic capital city, Minsk; and in the short time allotted to them, they began to rebuild their war-torn country. Unfortunately, however, the Byelorussians were not to enjoy their richly deserved reward for long. In December of that same year the Russian Bolsheviks expanded the area under their control. The Red army overran Byelorussia, which was annexed by the Soviet Union, with some 10 million Byelorussians as helpless victims.

Since then Byelorussians have been living under the oppressive yoke of their detested Communist overlords. Their lives are rigidly regimented and their labor is ruthlessly exploited. Their movements and behavior are closely watched by the ubiquitous state police, and they are forced to work for the Moscow-controlled Communist state. Their tyrannical bosses are trying to extinguish all ethnic and national sentiments among them, including all hope of freedom for Byelorussia.

Fortunately, even under these almost unbearable conditions, the liberty-loving Byelorussians still cling to their ideals of freedom and independence. In view of their steadfast dedication to these noble ideals, I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that they will have their reward in freedom. On this 47th anniversary of their independence I wish the Byelorussian people fortitude and forbearance in their struggle against totalitarian tyranny.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 47th anniversary of the signing of the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence.

It is altogether appropriate that we in America should join with all freemen in commemorating this date, for the Byelorussian people are no longer free to determine their own course in world history.

Their territory has been seized by the Soviet government and the people subjugated in a police state. Yet, there is strong evidence to indicate that the people have not been incorporated into the Communist view of total domination over the minds of men.

The Byelorussians retain their spirit of independence and their love of freedom.

In this citadel of freedom, the Congress of the United States, we are pleased to acknowledge the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence as a further bulwark against the tyrrany of political and personal oppression.

March 25, 1918, was a historic date in Byelorussian history and in world history. The expression of liberty and human dignity written into the declaration have lasted throughout the succeeding 47 years.

The Soviets may rule the land, but as long as there are those who remember

this great Declaration of Independence, no Soviet regime will conquer the free hearts of Byelorussia.

The Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the culture of America is the outward manifestation of our ideals, our aspirations, and our way of life—the reflection of our civilization itself.

This culture of ours is neither exclusive nor of recent development. While in many respects it mirrors our national aims and characteristics, our love of the fine arts, and science, our manners and customs, our inner motivations and impulses, our most profound goals, our loftiest concepts, it is essentially a composite of the past, a clear reflection of the present, and to some extent, probably a forecast of the future.

Our American culture reveals the things that are in our hearts, the preoccupations of our minds, and the deep-hidden stirring of our souls.

From other nations and people principally Western Europe but also many other parts of the world from the time of antiquity to the present, we have derived most of the basic patterns and ingredients that make up our culture.

In the broad sense, our culture embraces our freedoms and the governmental institutions we have developed to protect them, and it includes our dedication to the higher things of the spirit and the strong spiritual promptings which are, and until recently eroded substantially by materialism and other mechanistic philosophies always have been, a primary, fundamental basis of the American dream.

While culture embraces our manners, our social graces where we have them, our humane and compassionate reactions and the niceties and courtesies we display in our relations with others, it goes much deeper into our very system of government, our educational processes and our posture as a nation and a people in a world torn by strife, sorrow, fear, and uncertainty.

Culture is transmitted from one generation to another in the family circle, in the community, in the church, in the school, in the marts of trade and industry, and for the individual it does not necessarily require formal education, although that may be very helpful, and is becoming more increasingly necessary and desirable for the individual, since knowledge is, in the best sense, not only the progenitor, but the preserver and the disseminator, the creator and encourager of culture without which it will languish and wither.

To that end, we must as Americans be concerned more vitally and urgently than ever, though we seem not to be, with the development and spread of learning and the building of its facilities for generating the increase and dissemination of knowledge, because knowledge is the indispensable bloodstream and mainstream of our life and our civilization and the very bulwark of our freedom and the best promise of our future well-being, prosperity, happiness, and peace.

For this reason, and in order to promote the national good, we must constantly strive these days with intensified vigar and militant spirit of devotion and dedication to build and enrich this great heritage of American culture which is so much a part of our country and the differentiating characteristics of our people.

It is with these thoughts in mind that we note the recent progress report of the Commission on Humanities recommending a National Foundation for the Humanities.

My able, distinguished colleague and valued friend, Congressman WILLIAM MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, introduced in the House the bill embodying the recommendation of the Commission urging that "the United States must not limit its efforts to science and technology, but must give full value and support to artistic activity."

Those words were extremely well and appropriately spoken by my colleague, and I want to associate myself with them in approval and agreement.

I think the important thing now in this field is for the Congress to get a start in promoting this great work which is so closely related to the national interests, and the growth, the development of the Nation, and the well-being, advancement, and happiness of the American people, and in turn the many peoples of the world who have an orientation toward us and may be influenced by the example we set, good or bad. Of course, we intend always that it shall be good and wholesome, constructive and fruitful, for personal liberal, moral, and spiritual integrity and the betterment of mankind.

The role of the specialist in our current day society is vital and must be given closest attention, and we must by all means recognize that the role of the generalist is of preeminent importance, since it is from the pool of individuals trained in the humanities that the bulk of the great, essential, inspirational leadership of the Nation comes.

It is important that both specialists and generalists should work hand in hand, and that individuals of promise, ability, and aspiration be given fullest possible opportunity to secure the very best training and education to which he aspires. The doors to higher education should be open to all who aspire, and special encouragement and assistance must be given to highly qualified individuals who seek either specialized or generalized education.

There must be no invidious distinctions drawn between scientists and generalists—all should have the chance to get the best education of which they are capable. In this process, all should be treated equally and one group or one person should not be preferred over others unless on their merits they are entitled to special consideration. The fit must prevail, but those who earnestly aspire must not be turned aside. One of them may be a Newton, an Einstein, or a Michelangelo.

Legalized Gambling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. HANLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in our near-perfect government of checks and balances, the high resolve of one branch sometimes leads it into an error of excess, but in due course a correction invariably is made. Yet it remains the obligation of all of us always to confront the possibility of a mistake whenever we see or sense it, and to prevent it from initially being made.

In the matter of taxation to meet the growing costs and mounting needs of public works, education, and social services, we are—somewhat like Government—each guided by a stabilizing conscience. And so, a problem becomes virtually nil when the presented choice is between a further burden upon the economy or a serious injury to the country's social fabric.

Among the responsible and thoughtful people of the congressional district of New York State whom I have the honor to represent, a dedication to American mores has led to apprehensions and fears concerning a measure which has just been introduced for consideration before the New York State Legislature.

The bill would permit creation of a legalized off-track betting system in the city of New York for the stated purpose of raising revenue to run the city and to eliminate bookmaking, the illegal gambling racket which fertilizes an octopus-like criminal empire infecting this country. Who could challenge the objectives? But who could accept the false thesis that by increasing neighborhood gambling we can reduce the number of rodents who feed upon it?

This cannot be a party matter. Governors, Senators, and other civic leaders alike in New York State have opposed legalized off-track wagering. The roster of opposition includes the honored New York names of Lehman, Dewey, Harriman, Rockefeller, KENNEDY and JAVITS. The threatened legalization of off-track betting is something on which we must see eye to eye as Americans. The discussion has lasted too long among government leaders and the public in New York City; and both the support and opposition to the proposal have been strong.

The proposed act, incorporating the device of a public referendum to decide upon a matter which should not pass beyond the critical purview of a legislative body, would remove responsibility far

from the sociological expertise that it demands.

There exists nevertheless the imminent possibility of its passage.

What might appear on the surface to be an internal problem for the State of New York alone could, in truth, work far-reaching injury to our entire people. I come from the Syracuse area of upper New York State, removed by many miles from the city of New York and from the immediate impact of such legislation, but not by many miles from the ultimate influence of that great metropolis in action of this nature.

The more important problems which it would create, I am convinced, are of consequence even to those of you from other States and from areas where there is no horseracing and no wagering of note. The falling domino principle would surely apply to this bill endangering our Nation's social and economic fabric. No State, no community, would be left unhurt by this act which would, by its passage, accord to one State the right to sound the sociological tune for the Union.

The right of a State to legislate moral matters is a historic one, and there is no disposition here to dwell upon that aspect. However, a State's assumption of a right to legalize procedures, such as I have outlined, of unquestionably negative value touches on the national interest and might properly deserve the attention of the Congress. Legalized off-track betting would promote poverty, encourage criminality and so prey upon the poorer classes as to set itself in direct conflict with the meaningful antipoverty program hopefully initiated by this Congress. It would additionally impose new problems on the law enforcement agencies of our country.

Abundant evidence establishes that such a measure would be the seed from which would grow a vast injury to our economic stability and to our American ethic. No single State should undertake, inadvertently or not, to generate forces which might do violence to our people's basic and historic decency.

In Great Britain, where illegal cash betting with bookmakers abounded, neighborhood off-track betting offices were legalized in 1961. Among the purposes of the betting and gaming bill, as then expressed by a wide range of public officials, were: To ease the burden on the police; to keep gambling within reasonable bounds; to equalize treatment for different social classes of the community—the upper-income bettors had access to credit bookmakers, the poorer did not—and to do something to restore some respect for the law. Now, with less than 5 years of experience, there is ample reason to conclude that these aims have hardly been realized. Instead, there have been an increase in gambling turnover of at least 400 percent, with the lowest income areas particularly affected; juvenile indoctrination into gambling as an acceptable form of entertainment; a great increase in the number of bettors and a coincidental rise in the volume of bad debts and the divorce rate. Throughout Great Britain there are today more than 16,000 betting shops legalized with the owners paying taxes on the volume of wagering and taxes on income.

The accepted propriety of gambling—by implication on anything—has led to an extensive spread of gaming clubs where roulette, dice, one-armed bandits, cards, and other gambling opportunities are provided. We have of late seen advertisements in color in this country stating that Americans, are, of course, welcome to those clubs; and these are a reflection of how even a conservative society can alter one facet of its character, perhaps without conscious realization of the fact, over a short span of years.

There is pure horror in this situation. Its frightening aspects are skillfully described in a book only recently published, "Gambler's Money: The New Force in American Life," by Wallace Turner, Pulitzer Prize winning reporter on the New York Times. The author applies this description to one of our own garish cities:

> This is the strangest city in America. It is also the origin of an infectious immorality that rides out of the desert on a golden flood of gambling wealth to spread its peculiar brand of ethics across the Nation.

Concerned for our social fabric, Mr. Turner concludes:

> When gamblers are given a foothold in legality, they rapidly expand it into a permanent bridgehead from which they branch out in all directions. * * * At the very least, the gamblers must be contained. They must never be given the feeling that the general morality has been dragged down to their level. For if they do, they'll move a level lower and tug down on the rest of us from there.

It is argued now in New York that off-track betting will decrease bookmaking and ease the police burden, in addition to producing revenue variously estimated in a range from $10 million to $215 million for New York City. All of these contentions are patently unrealistic. Mr. Milton R. Wessel, an acknowledged expert on organized crime and law enforcement, who was chief Federal prosecutor of the 1959 Apalachin syndicate trial, ably covered aspects of the proposal in an article entitled, "Legalized Gambling—The Dreams and the Realities," published in the January 18, 1965, edition of the Nation magazine and reprinted in an excerpted version in the New York Herald Tribune of January 21, 1965.

Mr. Wessel states:

> The New York State Commission of Investigation, in a sweeping series of raids during the fall of 1959, seized the actual account books of underworld gambling operations and so was able to pinpoint the sources of gambling cash. A resulting study showed the following: (1) baseball gambling represents 50 percent more money than horserace betting; (2) football betting is one-third larger than horseracing; (3) even basketball represents nearly as large a betting handle as do the horses. In addition, there is an enormous play on the numbers (policy) and a smaller, but substantial, play on boxing and hockey.
>
> No bookie in the city of New York is going to close up shop just because legalized off-track betting (granting all the claims of its advocates) has deprived him of about one-seventh of his profits.

The fantasy becomes even more absurd when one examines in detail the proposals of the New York plan.

As if to confirm Mr. Wessel's conclusion—from actual statistics—long in advance, the New York Times, of October 1, 1963, in an article by Charles Grutzner, exploring the effect of activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the local scene at that time, stated:

> About the only thing that is not worrying the bookmakers is * * * State legislation to permit municipal horse parlors with legal off-track betting. The bookmakers believe that, instead of being put out of business by such competition, they would get extra business.
>
> The surviving bookmakers are not running too fast to pause for a horselaugh if you ask whether legalized off-track betting parlors operated by the city would put them out of business.
>
> "If anything can help this sick business back into prosperity it would be a municipal horse room in every neighborhood," said one.
>
> "In Britain off-track betting has quadrupled since they legalized bookmaking 2 years ago.
>
> "Once betting on the races is made legal and respectable every other housewife will run to the nearest horse parlor to risk a couple of bucks. She'll soon find out that the illegal book will take her parlays, back-to-back bets and markers (play on credit) and carry her winnings to her. She won't have these privileges at a legal horse room. So, with a woman's experience in shopping, she'll take the bargain and never mind whether it's legal."
>
> This bookmaker, whose views were shared by a majority of those interviewed, said legal horse parlors would become magnets for illegal bookmakers to operate in the vicinity.
>
> The bigtime bookmakers—and there still are several—could not care less. Three-fourths of their business now is on sports games. And their big horseplayers are business executives or racketeers who want instant service by [redacted]. They envision no serious competition from a legal horse parlor where the bet must be made in person.

The real victim of legalized off-track betting would be the poorer classes. In effect, this was clearly indicated as an incidental result of a survey financed by Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., preparatory to its televising of a study in depth on off-track betting. The survey, dated November 1963, was undertaken by International Research Associates, Inc., and among its findings there were several which were particularly indicative: First, one out of four people who are currently not racetrack goers find the idea of a city-operated station appealing and think it would encourage them to bet.

Second. Puerto Rican men are significantly more likely than other New York men to say that they would use the city-operated off-track betting stations.

Third. Negro men are more likely than others to say they would bet almost daily; and

Fourth. Seventeen percent of New York's female population say that they will bet if the centers are provided by the city.

The implications are obvious for all to see. The technical problems involved,

including a high cost of operation, appear to be matters significant only to the State of New York, which at present derives approximately $135 million directly from wagering at racetracks within the State. But surface appearances are rejected by responsible businessmen among my constituents who, more than depending upon a sense of foreboding, question the preachments and practices which an off-track betting law would set in motion.

Is it not devious for a government to encourage widespread gambling, figuratively in every neighborhood, rather than to offer honorable solution of its fiscal problems by furthering a sense of civic responsibility? Is it not fiscally unsound to spend $1 in order to reap $2 in taxation when the present cost in New York State is one-fiftieth of that cost? Is it not unwise conditioning of a people to develop what has aptly been termed the "something-for-nothing syndrome"?

We live in an era of rapidly growing national economy, when the Nation is dedicating itself to an unlimited war on poverty and to the maintenance of its dignity and improvement of its image and its prestige. We must continue to strengthen all our safeguards and to oppose all threats to those goals. It is with that awareness I seek to alert this Congress at this time.

Someday soon, perhaps sooner than we now realize, it may be necessary for this House of Representatives to demonstrate its serious concern.

Fino Offers Bold Legislation for Federal Authority To Surmount the Rail Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to create a Federal Northeastern Transportation Authority to subsidize, rehabilitate, and restructure passenger transportation between lower Maine and northern Virginia—the jurisdictional area is delineated in detail below.

My bill sidesteps a number of the shortcomings of the legislation so far offered—unsuccessfully—to bring Federal aid to bear on the deteriorating rail situation. The bill calls for a wholly Federal authority to subsidize and regulate passenger transportation. The Authority proposed is not dependent on State financial support or political concurrence. The bill proposes wholly Federal financing of the passenger transportation deficit, in keeping with my concept of passenger transportation as an ultimately Federal responsibility. The bill provides for the structuring of the proposed Authority within the framework of an existing transportation program—the Mass Transportation Act of 1964. The bill would make available to the Northeast Transportation Authority $50 million of the money authorized to be appropriated annually for the mass transportation program.

The purposes of the Authority proposed under my bill would be severalfold. Initially, it would aim at the immediate rehabilitation of failing rail passenger services. This would be done by negotiating "cost plus" contracts with passenger carriers, whereby those carriers were given the difference between revenues of the required service and the cost of providing that service, plus a percentage of that cost as profit. Until the Authority should certify itself as ready to perform this task, the bill would empower the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration to make appropriate contracts with passenger carriers. A key objective of the proposed Authority would be the regularization of commuter rail service on a reliable contract basis.

The Authority would also, as proposed, seek to develop high-speed intramegalopolitan rail service, and would be authorized to use a share of moneys presently authorized to be used for demonstration projects by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

If constituted as set forth in the bill, the Authority would exercise rate and route regulatory powers over megalopolitan air, rail, and bus passenger transportation as presently exercised by the ICC and CAB. These powers would be so exercised as to aim at the development of a more efficient and economical megalopolitan transportation structure. Wasteful competition would eventually be eliminated. Transportation resources would be rationalized: air, rail, and surface transit would be used for appropriate distances or districts. The regulatory powers of the proposed Authority would eventually—used in conjunction with cost-plus passenger service contracts—be exercised so as to withdraw carriers from service obligations that could be better handled by another type of carrier.

The Authority would also be empowered, where necessary, to purchase or operate a carrier, although its power to take over properties without additional congressional consent would be limited to purchases of under $20 million. No passenger carrier could discontinue megalopolitan passenger service without the consent of the Authority.

The proposed Authority would have seven Commissioners appointed for 5-year terms, initially staggered. The salaries of Commissioners would be $21,000 per annum.

The proposed Authority would be financed by appropriation until such time as it might be granted the power to issue revenue bonds in connection with later undertaken specific operations or construction.

Since December, when I first began work on this bill, I have watched the railroads edge closer and closer to total abandonment of passenger service. These developments should not be a surprise. In the last quarter century, passenger service has shown a profit only during the war years. There is nothing new about the dilemma of the railroads, except the publicity that dilemma has received. Now we have come to the point where we must face up to the need—the immediate need—for large-scale Government aid.

Recently, the Regional Plan Association released comments of commuter railroad presidents the gist of which was that all the commuter lines serving the New York metropolitan area are willing to hand over their passenger operations to a responsible Government agency if Government subsidies are not forthcoming. These officials do, however, prefer the idea that the Government should contract for commuter service—or in essence, subsidize such service—in different areas rather than take over the railroads. I agree. I prefer the concept of "equalization payments" by which the Government pays for the difference between revenues and costs of providing what is, after all, a necessary public service, to the concept of Government owned and operated railroads. My bill aims at setting up a framework for Government financial aid—and not only to railroads, although they are our immediate concern, but to other carriers as well.

In my opinion, the political and financial responsibility for such financial aid and control must lie with the Federal Government. The simple reason is that the Federal Government has both the power and the money. The several States have little of either. They seem unable to agree on any plans that have any real teeth or treasury. Probably any State plans would involve largely Federal money in any event, so it is my feeling that the political body created to deal with the transportation problem in the Northeast ought to be a Federal agency. Ultimately, the financial and planning power of the Federal Government must be brought to bear—and there is no time like the present.

I am not proposing a nationwide agency. For the moment, I think we would do well to test a Federal transportation authority's ability to do the job in the area where the problem is most pressing—the northeastern urban "megalopolis." I do not think that these problems are the problems of metropolitan New York alone. I think that the problems of the urban coastal area are highly interrelated, and that controlled development of transportation in the Northeast should be on an integrated rather than scattered basis. It would not be fair to subsidize only the metropolitan New York transportation problem. The crisis presenting itself today is an opportunity and a challenge to regularize and modernize the entire northeastern transportation complex. A halfhearted, haphazard, and piecemeal attack on this problem will cost double tomorrow what it saves today.

I hope that progressive transportation thinking will not be shunted aside in the name of economy, because, as I said, such would only be false economy. I also hope that this proposal will not be branded as sectional, for while it is true that it is aimed at the transportation complex of just one area, it is also aimed to provide a trial run in Federal participation in passenger transportation.

What can be learned in the Northeast can be applied to other areas as the economic patterns of those areas move, as they must, toward the socioeconomic complexity of the Northeast. Perhaps a Great Lakes Region Authority or a Southern Pacific Coastal Authority might follow a successful Northeastern Authority.

This is an innovative measure, but it is a considered one, hammered out as the sound points and shortcomings of other transportation proposals have exposed themselves. We live in an age of supercities and superproblems. There is an ever-growing and necessary interrelation of politics and multidirectional growth planning. I urge the Congress to mold the future rather than be buffeted by it. This is a challenge to be grasped, not ignored.

Following is the megalopolitan jurisdiction:

THE MEGALOPOLITAN JURISDICTION

Maine: Counties of Cumberland and York.
New Hampshire: Counties of Hillsboro and Rockingham.
Massachusetts: All counties.
Rhode Island: All counties.
Connecticut: All counties.
New York: Counties of Suffolk, Nassau, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York, Bronx, Westchester, Rockland, Putnam, Orange, Dutchess, Sullivan, Ulster, Greene, Columbia, Albany, Rensselaer, and Schenectady.
New Jersey: All counties.
Pennsylvania: Counties of Pike, Lackawanna, Luzerne, Monroe, Northampton, Lehigh, Berks, Schuylkill, Lebanon, Dauphin, York, Lancaster, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, Bucks, and Philadelphia.
Maryland: All counties save Garrett and Allegany.
Delaware: All counties.
District of Columbia.
Virginia: Counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, Prince William and Fauquier.

Lead, Zinc, and Copper Disposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am desirous of expressing my warm appreciation to all those who were so helpful and considerate to me and our committee in facilitating the favorable consideration by the House on Tuesday, March 23, under unanimous consent of the bill, H.R. 1496, as amended by the Senate. This measure authorizes the disposal, without regard to the 6 months waiting period, of lead, zinc, and copper from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

As the House understands, this bill provides for the disposal of certain urgently needed strategic materials, principally lead, zinc, and copper that are urgently needed by industry to alleviate current shortages which are causing part-time operation and unemployment in certain industries, and are now threatening to cause even greater unemployment and more serious conditions in these industries.

I want to commend the subcommittee for its prompt, expeditious consideration in reporting the lead and zinc bills when they were before us. It was our expectation and intention to proceed promptly with consideration of several bills for disposal of copper that were pending in the House, but which lacked needed reports from the Federal agencies concerned.

However, when the lead and zinc bills were sent to the other body, certain amendments were added to the zinc bill providing for copper disposal. We should have much preferred to conduct our own hearings on copper in the House, but under the circumstances, since this measure and the lead bill were incorporated into the zinc bill, we did not feel it would be desirable to duplicate the Senate hearings. It was the decision of the House Armed Services Committee to expedite action on these disposals by accepting the Senate amendments, even though we felt that it would have been better to proceed with hearings on each individual disposal request, and in accordance with our practice, receive adequate evidence concerning the subject matter of pending copper bills, thus giving those who introduced measures on this subject full opportunity to be heard and have their witnesses heard and thus enable our committee to make its own record in our own committee hearings.

However, I feel that we have discharged our duty to the House and to all those concerned in accepting the Senate amendments in this particular instance, even though we do not want it to be understood or construed that this established a precedent that would be followed in the future.

We have made every possible effort to safeguard the national interest in these disposals and to prevent the disruption of markets and price variations to the extent that can be done by legislation, and we have taken great pains to assure there will be orderly, fair, equitable disposal procedures and that our committee will be in a position to follow up these matters to make sure that the intent of this legislation is being followed in every feasible, practicable manner.

In all these disposals, it is our expectation that the Government will make a profit from the sales taking place as a result of the action of the Congress on this bill.

There are so many people who are serving and assisting our committee in these matters that it would not be possible to enumerate all of them here. I do want to express my warm, personal appreciation to my very distinguished chairman, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, who contributed so invaluably to the results achieved, to the officials of the Government, particularly the General Services Administration, the Office of Emergency Planning and those from industry who gave us the benefit of their views and their valued cooperation.

I am also especially thankful to several distinguished friends and colleagues of the committee and the House who introduced bills for the disposal of copper and who so graciously withdrew their request for House committee hearings in order to expedite final action. Some of these colleagues are: the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN], both members of the Armed Services Committee, and our esteemed colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN], the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON], and my valued colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

I think that the example set by all these and other distinguished gentlemen in the House on Tuesday in expediting this bill is one of the finest instances of wholehearted cooperation I have seen during my service here, and I hope the passage of the bill will be helpful in alleviating the shortages of these valuable metals and improve the sorry plight of several industries faced with operational and unemployment problems as a result of present conditions affecting the availability of these materials.

Senator Dirksen Interviewed on the Art of Political Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the most delightful recent television interviews, and certainly one of the most informative ones, was conducted by Joseph F. McCaffrey with Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, as his guest. I have gone to considerable pains to get a transcript of the interview with our esteemed minority leader because I think the Senate should share in the wisdom which marks the comments of our colleague. The interview was first broadcast on WMAL–ABC TV, Washington, D.C., on February 7, 1965, on Mr. McCaffrey's program known as "Closeup."

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the interview be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JOSEPH MCCAFFREY. Good evening, I'm Joseph McCaffrey. Welcome again to "Closeup, the Capitol." My guest this evening needs no introduction to anyone who has ever watched television, certainly no introduction at all to anyone who is interested in public affairs. This gentleman first came to Congress as a Member of the House in 1933 and served there until he retired voluntarily in January 1949. He was elected then to the Senate in 1950 and has served there ever since. I think if there was a Congressional Hall of Fame, and I really think there should be one, that this gentleman would be the first man who would be selected for it. Because he is, and I am sure that almost any other reporter who covers the Hill will agree,

the complete Senator. He is the perfect Senator, if in the world of human beings there is such a thing as anyone who is perfect or anything that is perfect. And in just one moment I will yield the balance of the time on this program to the distinguished minority leader of the U.S. Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. Senator DIRKSEN, in many ways it is a miracle that you were in the Senate, in that no one ever thought you would return to public life when you left the House. The verdict was that you were going to be blind. Will you tell us the fears and feelings that went through your mind at that time?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, I remember the incident rather vividly. I had six or seven physicians including one here in Washington, a very noted physician who was an eye specialist who had been in the Wilmer Clinic at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore. I recall so well the day when he called in the morning and said there was a division of opinion as between him and others as to whether this retinitis condition was malignant or not, but they thought at least I ought to go to Johns Hopkins and think about having an enucleation—which is a nice fancy word for the removal of one of your eyes. I remember how Mrs. Dirksen and I wept when the news came. I very dutifully went to Baltimore that morning on the train. I remember telling the surgeon over there afterward, when I got there, that I had consulted with another doctor and came to the conclusion that I would not permit the removal of my eye. He said, "What doctor?" "Oh," I said, "A very great big doctor, He lives way upstairs." "Oh," he said, "You are one of those guys, are you?" I said, "Yes, I am. I am a rather rough, uncouth sort of a person, but I am one of those guys." He said, "All right, if that is the way you want it; I'm going to California tomorrow so make up your mind." I said, "I have made up my mind," and that was it. That is my good eye. The other one has some scar tissue on it but it does very well for peripheral vision. Incidentally I became an expert on eyes myself at that time but there is something that hits you, you can just envision a black world for a while.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Did you have any fear, any panic when they first talked to you about this?

Senator DIRKSEN. I would not call it panic but I was fully sensible of what confronted me and how serious this really was because just think of those limitations on what you can do and how long you have to be out of circulation before you can undertake to get anything done and learn an entirely new technique where you feel your way in the world.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Senator, those who observed you during your years from 1933 until 1949 in the House and who have observed you since your return here to the Senate say that you have changed a great deal, that you may have mellowed perhaps. How would you compare yourself in the Senate today with yourself when you were in the House? Do you see or think there is any difference in you as an individual as an operating Member of Congress?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, I think you will have to remember first of all, that I am somewhat older than I was in those days. I came here at age 36 or 37, full of energy and ready to just fairly push the dome off the Capitol, until older and well demeaned Members advised me that that dome has been there since they came and would be there when they were gone and would be there when I was gone. So perhaps it might be well to slow down a little. Then I think you learn certain things which somehow fill out your philosophy as a legislator and I pretty much agree with this kind of language—that this free government is like an old waterlogged scow, it doesn't move very fast, it doesn't move very far at one time, but it never sinks and maybe that is the reason we have a free government today. I was thinking how many free governments are just in too great a hurry that suddenly flop over and take on a dictatorial and despotic cast because they can't wait for normal forces to undertake the changes that are necessary in the constant climb of people to a better life.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Senator DIRKSEN, you have been criticized at times for not being consistent—that over the years, your position on various issues has changed.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well consistency is a hobgoblin of small minds—was it Emerson who said it?—a foolish consistency or an inconsistency and I have often thought the only people who do not change their minds are sleeping peacefully in some cemetery or they are in an institution—involuntarily there—and have lost the capacity to change their mind. So I hope that the time will never come when I can't adjust to new circumstances and new conditions because it is an accelerated world. How fast it moves—and I need only to get a touch of nostalgia and dip into my past; go way back to my boyhood days—to see the changes that have taken place to become thoroughly sensible of what has happened in this world.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. How would you sum up your philosophy of life, Senator?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, I want to be ready for change at all times. I think I subscribe fully to the definition of progress as the constant and intelligent and undramatic action of life on what is here. Perhaps I can best illustrate it by saying the atom has been here ever since this world was created but it has taken all these millions of years to break it down, to fracture it, to find it, to see what is inside of it, and to lay open this great force that has changed the whole destiny of the world and the destiny of mankind.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Any Senator has a hectic pace in life and because Senator DIRKSEN is the Minority Leader in the U.S. Senate, his pace is even more hectic. It is nothing for him, for example, to have 150–200 people to come to see him in the course of a day and how does he get away from this? We have some pictures which I would like to show you at this time to illustrate how a Senator, in this case Senator DIRKSEN, relaxes. These are pictures—these are some of your flowers, Senator—and this is Mrs. Dirksen with you at your home in Leesburg and what do you grow down there? What crops do you grow?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, frankly, we grow a little bit of everything. Not only in the vegetable line but in the flower line as well. I do not want to be an expert. I do not want to be a professional. I never want to loose my amateur standing—

Mr. MCCAFFREY. As a gardener?

Senator DIRKSEN. As a gardener and so I go for these very simple things that give me a lot of joy whether you grow them singly or in great masses. People wonder some about my fidelity to the marigold. Well, take a marigold in great mass and it lasts right up to frost and are here all summer and fall. You can enjoy the mass color anywhere in the garden and it is a hardy flower. But I love petunias, I like to dabble a little in roses and on a small scale I do fairly well at it. I love zinnias because of their rich color. They just absorb all the color in the sun and what a gorgeous sight it is to see them in great mass colors all through the summer and it is another hardy flower, so hardy in fact that it has a way of resisting bugs. So does petunias. But that gives me a lot of fun and variety and then I garden a little in the vegetable field. Start early—that I learned as a boy—starting with radishes and lettuce and onions, the first to mature in early spring. And then you move on to carrots and turnips and to red beets and then, of course, you always have a stand of potatoes and a stand of tomatoes. I always have a little kale. There must be one green vegetable with plenty of iron content.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Senator, in your youth you aspired to be an actor. In fact, you did write and sell and produce some plays——

Senator DIRKSEN. Very little but at least——

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Well, you got paid for them and there are a lot of playwrights who have never been able to sell, you know. How related is politics to the theater, would you say?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, you have this common identity. To begin with, you deal with people. You are in front of people in political life even as you are on the stage and out of it there must develop a poise, a certain presence, a capacity for putting your thoughts in words, in poignant expression, so that it is conveyed to people and persuades them and in that respect there is complete identity between the theater and I think, political life.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. One of the main requirements, it seems to me, of a man in public life is that he had patience, that he be able to suffer fools gladly and that he take all the other little inconveniences which comes along and doesn't let these things get to him. Is this something that you have to be born with or can men in public life learn to adjust to all these things?

Senator DIRKSEN. They can learn but——

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Some of them don't.

Senator DIRKSEN. No, the gift of patience, of course I think, is a highly desired attribute because you are dealing with people, they have fixations, they have convictions about any number of controversial matters. You have to hear them out. You have to be careful not to be too precipitous or capricious in pointing out what you think the weakness in the other fellows case may be, especially if he is on your side of the aisle politically speaking. So that requires, I think, gentle discussion and a very gentle oil can art as I call it, so that the bearings never get hot. You don't develop frictions that suddenly blow into pieces and if you can keep it on the quiet side and have every aspect of the matter explored without anybody becoming fractious at any time you're most likely to get results. What was it that Lincoln said—we shall sooner have the chicken by hatching the egg than by breaking it.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Is this the secret of your great ability to work compromises? Now there are many examples, in your case, of your ability to bring about a compromise, the most classic one and the one that will go on the history books certainly is the work you did on the civil rights bill last year in the Senate. Is this the secret of being able to get men to work together?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Restraining yourself first perhaps?

Senator DIRKSEN. If you have a common objective it is the starting point of course. There may be a dozen roads to get there. Some of them tortuous, some not satisfactory, some of them difficult, some of them over high ground—where lies the best road with the fewest barriers or obstacles in it? Well, it takes some doing, of course, to finally work around until you get into that road and that does require patience and you do have to hear the other fellow's case. He may not agree with you at all but, little by little, whatever difficulties are in the way begin to yield and before you know it you are at the end of the road and it looks as if it has been consummated by a rather satisfactory joining. And you say, all right, that's the route to get there, that's the route back, and that is the route up there again.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. In your 30 years in Congress, you have served with hundreds of men

and women. What do you think is the great hazard—now we are speaking as human beings—of public life? Do you think it is drinking or do you think it is the inability or refusal to grow as times go on or do you think it is a development toward cynicism that is apparent in some Members?

Senator DIRKSEN. First of all, there is a danger of getting into a political rut, so to speak, and life may go by you. That's very unfortunate indeed. That means, of course, that you will not adjust. What was it that Lincoln said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

Mr. MCCAFFREY. If you come from Illinois you have to know Lincoln, don't you?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes; and then he added this one part. He said: "We must disenthrall ourselves and then we shall save our country." That is a great line and I think over and over a person in public life has to take inventory, to see where he is at the moment, to take a look back to see from whence you came and then see where the high road goes and then if your thinking is not attuned to it you disenthrall yourself. You take a new stance and a new look and if you are willing to look long enough and hard enough, I am rather confident that the right cast of mind and the right thoughts will come which are adequate to what lies ahead.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. As a person and also in your many public statements you are always the optimist. Does your optimism ever falter in the face of all of the problems that face us today not only at home but also abroad?

Senator DIRKSEN. No, because even if there are frustrations and goodness knows every life is attended with some frustration certainly; there is still ample time and room and cause for optimism because there are so many good things and so many blessings that you can count in life that come. So I see no reason why one shouldn't look on the optimistic side. Besides how can you look on life constructively without being an optimist because it is the only aggressive, affirmative attitude of mind that will do you any good in coping with a problem there on the doorstep everyday.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. You served under five Presidents, from F.D.R. through Johnson. Taking them one at a time, how would you appraise these men beginning with Franklin Delano Roosevelt. You were elected the same year he was first elected, 1932. You survived his big sweep of 1936 too.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, how should you appraise different personalities. Franklin Roosevelt and the mellifluous voice who had a way of charming people and did charm the country. There were so many things with which I disagreed in those days, many with which I agreed, many with which my constituents disagreed and then they used to scold me a good deal about it. But certainly a personality of a type all its own that is rather rare. Then followed by Truman, rather mundane, rather earthy who could chop off his words. I had a great regard for Truman. He could scold you in language that you could understand and at the same time he could pat you on the back. I recall when I went to say goodby to Truman after this eye malady struck me and I said I would wait in Washington until I went to say goodby. And I said, Mr. President, the custom is to pack your bags and get out of this town overnight but I would not do it. And he said to me at the White House, "Why did you quit? We need fellows like you around here." Well, when I got around to the Senate race, finally after friends importuned me, I remember Truman took me apart as nobody ever did as if he had never seen me in his life, yet he thought they needed me around here. When they observed his 80th birthday, I think, I was there and made a speech on the occasion and I joshed him a little about it and he laughed and he said, "Oh, DIRKSEN, life is like that." So he was a different type entirely but he had those who were devoted to him with a deep and affectionate devotion. And then of course, there came Dwight Eisenhower. As the whole world knows, I was for Bob Taft and I didn't know how President Eisenhower would think about me and particularly some of the remarks I made in the nominating speech in Chicago. You may remember that one line I said was that it wouldn't take a committee investigation to determine Bob Taft's politics. Maybe at the time I said it I wasn't fully conscious of the fact that it was quite a little dig but President Eisenhower and I became the firmest of friends and I carried the flag for him on issues and controversies.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Let you have that hot poker.

Senator DIRKSEN. I used to say that if nobody will pick up the hot poker I will pick it up. And then came the late John Kennedy. Of course, we had known each other for 10 or 12 years before he acceded to the Presidency. We knew each other in the House and we knew each other in the Senate. I had great affection for him and I think it was reciprocated. There was something genteel and gracious, there was a sublime grace about John Kennedy and it stuck to him all his days. And how often he called me to the White House to sit for perhaps an hour to talk about many things and say, "Where am I on this?" "Well, Mr. President, you're not." And then the question, how to get results? And of course, it is quite a compliment, I think, when the President who bears another party label from mine calls me to ask how he gets out of a difficulty and extricates himself from a real problem in the Senate. My duty as an American, of course, with an allegiance and fidelity to my country requires that I help him. I would be a poor citizen indeed if I didn't do the same for any President regardless of his politics where the country's interest is at stake. But he was truly a great character in my book. Now President Johnson and I sat across the aisle from each other——

Mr. MCCAFFREY. The man you probably know the best.

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, he as majority leader and I as minority leader. We used to make medicine, as I say, over in his office. Of course we had to make book and make schedule on what came up. The Senate is a two-way street, that is one thing we are always agreed on. A minority leader with some backing could just truss up the Senate any old time with a filibuster or anything else and stop it in its tracks and the majority leader could do likewise. And so we agreed that we had to work together because the overriding interest was the well-being and the welfare of the Republic, the United States of America. It was on that ground we used to battle it out and believe me we have had some hot and tempestuous times in his office and in mine but never at any time did either of us lose sight of the fact that the objective was the country and its people.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Let me ask you the final question, Senator DIRKSEN, and this is always an unfair question, perhaps. But looking back over your life—and you said you do look back every once in a while—looking back over your life is there anything that you would undo that you did or is there anything that you didn't do that you would like to have done?

Senator DIRKSEN. Just one. That is when I voted for a bill while in the House of Representatives in the Truman administration to send miners and perhaps railroaders into the Army unless they quit striking and went back to work. That is the bill that Senator Taft stopped in its tracks in the Senate and as I look back I think if I could undo a vote that vote I would undo.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. A pretty good record with only one regret out of what—maybe 3,000 votes or 5,000 votes that you've cast.

Senator DIRKSEN. It could be, but you see, there we were all caught up in a vortex of feeling that extended all through the country and people were getting pretty harsh about it and naturally that is reflected in the halls of Congress so perhaps they will stake me one vote that I regret. I do regret that one, of course.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. I'll be back in 1 minute.

Senator DIRKSEN. I want to thank you very much for a delightful program.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words from Philippians 3:13–14: *Reaching forth, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for this significant day when we are paying tribute and honor to two American patriots and heroes.

We proudly acknowledge that they have captured our imagination and admiration by soaring upward and onward into space.

Grant that their achievement may symbolize the faith and courage we need for the adventure of the aspiring and ascending moral and spiritual life.

Expand and enlarge our minds and hearts with a passion to attain unto the highland and heavenly life.

We humbly confess that there may be many obstacles, but Thou wilt sustain us with this assurance:

"He who, from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright."

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order before the Journal is read?

Mr. GOODELL. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.